The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/midamericahistor37unse

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Quarterly

277.73 0V
I 291 i
V. 37

VOLUME XXXVII
(New Series, Volume XXVI)
1955

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVII

ARTICLES

"SUNSET" COX, LEADER OF LINCOLN'S LOYAL OPPOSITION, 1861–1865. *David Lindsey* 3

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE ALABAMA BLACK BELT, 1875–1917. *Glenn N. Sisk* 31

AN EPISCOPAL CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY. *Peter J. Rahill* 48

BRITAIN AND DIRECT SPANISH AMERICAN TRADE, 1815–1925. *Bernadine Pietraszek* 67

THE FRONTIER ARMY OFFICER, 1794–1814. *Norman W. Caldwell* 101

THE CONSUL IN A CRISIS: LOWER CALIFORNIA, 1911. *Lowell L. Blaisdell* 131

PEDRO DE MERCADO AND MEXICAN JESUIT RECRUITS. *Ernest J. Burrus* 140

PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS AND SPANISH MISSIONARIES—1565–1700. *John Leddy Phelan* 153

TEXAS STATE AID FOR INDIGENT SOLDIERS, 1861–1865. *William Frank Zornow* 171

THE ENLISTED SOLDIER AT THE FRONTIER POST, 1790–1814. *Norman W. Caldwell* 195

CATHOLIC PRESS REACTION TO THE CUSTER DISASTER. *Marie Louise Schulte* 205

CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND THE POLICIES OF JAMES II. *Bernard Norling* 215

FATHER PIRET LANDS IN NEW YORK, 1846—DOCUMENT. *Alexis A. Praus* 229

BOOK REVIEWS 56, 176, 236

NOTES AND COMMENTS 60, 184, 241

INDEX 244

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 37, NUMBER 1 JANUARY 1955

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1955

VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

"SUNSET" COX, LEADER OF LINCOLN'S LOYAL OPPOSITION, 1861–1865 . . . *David Lindsey* 3

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE ALABAMA BLACK BELT, 1875–1917 . . . . . *Glenn N. Sisk* 31

AN EPISCOPAL CONTRIBUTION TO HISTORY . . *Peter J. Rahill* 48

BOOK REVIEWS 56

NOTES AND COMMENTS 60

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS
RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, $2.00; in foreign countries, $2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA
An Historical Review
JANUARY 1955
VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 1

"Sunset" Cox, Leader of Lincoln's Loyal Opposition, 1861-1865

Of the many tangled aspects of Civil War politics, the activity of the loyal opposition has received perhaps the least attention from historians. Penetrating and exhaustive studies have been made of the Lincoln administration's relation to the Copperheads, the Radicals, the war governors and political appointees,[1] but little consideration has been given to the moderate loyal Democrats. Of all the politicians of the "blundering generation," these men have been most completely submerged from the view of later generations. Moderate Democrats, who supported the war with reservations, criticized the Lincoln administration, urged respect for traditional American civil liberties even in wartime and worked for a speedy end of conflict and restoration of the Union to its former status.

Followers of Stephen A. Douglas in the troubled pre-war decade, these men generally operated in the moderate spirit of the "little Giant." After Sumter, this group found its position increasingly awkward. Douglas's death on June 3, 1861, left Northern Democrats not only embarrassed but virtually leaderless. Of all the Democrats who endeavored to fill Douglas's shoes, probably none remained closer to the Douglas position than Samuel Sullivan Cox, Congressman from Ohio's Columbus district and minority floor leader in the House of Representatives during the war years.

[1] Wood Gray, *The Hidden Civil War*, New York, 1942; George Fort Milton, *Abraham Lincoln and the Fifth Column*, New York, 1942; T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals*, Madison, 1941; William B. Hesseltine, *Lincoln and the War Governors*, New York, 1948; Harry J. Carman and Richard H. Luthin, *Lincoln and the Patronage*, and, of course, James G. Randall, *Lincoln the President*, 3 vols., 1945–1952.

Born in Zanesville, Ohio, educated at Ohio and Brown Universities,[2] Cox practiced law briefly in the Cincinnati office of George E. Pugh before moving to Columbus where he became editor-part-owner of the *Ohio Statesman* in 1853. A florid, front-page editorial describing a spectacular sunset won him the nickname "Sunset," which not only fitted his initials exactly but proved a useful handle for voters to attach to an aspiring politician.[3]

A lifelong Democrat, Cox entered Congress in 1857 and immediately identified himself with the Douglas wing of his party in fighting admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution.[4] Though small in stature and slight of build, Cox impressed his fellow Congressmen with his genial manner, bursting vitality, powerful voice, skill in parliamentary process and debate and finesse in political maneuvering. Always active, pondering new ideas, forceful as an extemporaneous speaker, he became immensely popular and influential with his associates, even with opponents whom he needled.

As storm clouds of impending conflict thickened in 1859, Cox urged conciliatory moderation, and full respect for the rights of all sections. Extreme, radical agitation of the slavery question he deplored as dangerous since it tended to make any working arrangement to hold the sections together impossible. Extremists Joshua Giddings, Benjamin F. Wade, and Salmon P. Chase he denounced vehemently.[5]

Disappointed over Douglas's failure to win the Presidency, Cox worked valiantly during the trying winter of 1860–1861 to prevent rupture of the Union, urging acceptance of the Crittenden compromise in December. When that failed, he served as secretary of an eleventh-hour Congressional committee seeking a formula to

---

[2] William V. Cox and Milton H. Northrup, *Life of Samuel Sullivan Cox*, Syracuse, 1899, 22–39, 43–46, 54–56; *General Catalogue of the Ohio University, 1804–1857*, Athens, 1857, 12–13; personal interview with the late Professor Thomas N. Hoover, historian of Ohio University; Brown University records at the registrar's and alumni offices. The John Hay Library at Brown University now houses a substantial collection of Cox correspondence written in later years; this will be referred to as Cox Papers.

[3] *Ohio Statesman*, May 19, 1853.

[4] Charles J. Foster (Democratic national committeeman) to Cox, August 21, 1856; William Bell to Cox, May 20, 1856, Cox Papers, Brown University Library; *Ohio Statesman*, September 21, 23, October 4, 1856; *Ohio State Journal*, Columbus, October 11, November 10, 1856; *Congressional Globe*, 35 Cong., 1 sess., 53–57, 261–263.

[5] *Cong. Globe*, 36 Cong., 1 sess., 74–80, 581, 619.

save the crumbling Union in the last days of 1860.[6] At the beginning of 1861 Cox made a powerful plea in the House for preserving the Union at all costs despite the already announced withdrawal of four Southern states. "Appalled at the collossal strides of revolution," Cox denied the right of secession. The South should not withdraw because "progress itself" demanded that the Union hold together. "Let there be *sacrifice* and *compromise*. These words are of honorable import. The one gave us Calvary, the other the Constitution. Nothing worth having was ever won without them." The Republican regime would not be the dangerous threat the South feared: "Mr. Lincoln in the White House will not be the rail splitter out of it. Abraham in faith may offer up his 'irrepressible' offspring. He will be conservative to the total oblivion of the radical. The one will 'conflict' with the other." Cox concluded with a ringing plea for unity: "Clouds are about us! There is lightning in their frown! Cannot we direct it harmlessly to earth? The prayer of the people I speak for in such weakness, rises in strength . . . that our States continue to be . . . one."[7]

As a man of reasonable moderation, Cox strove anxiously to avert catastrophe. The press of events, however, and the rabid determination of ultra extremists on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line were too much to hold in check. In Cox's apt phrase, "But it is ever thus. History shows it. Extreme men drag moderate men with them."[8]

Cox watched helplessly as the confederacy organized at Montgomery, as the Washington Peace Conference failed and as Buchanan wearily passed on his burdens to Lincoln on March 4. Cox's hopes rose as Lincoln's inaugural gave the South reassurance. But even so, the Ohio representative sensed tragedy at hand, noting the apprehension that hung over the inauguration: "For the first time in the Republic a Chief Magistrate is installed under the protection of artillery charged with grape and cannister."[9]

Emotionalism had been stirred too high for reasonable men to change the tune. Events moved too rapidly. A sense of tragic helplessness overcame Cox.[10] He later described it:

---

6 *Ibid.*, 36 Cong., 2 sess., 36; S. S. Cox, *Three Decades of Federal Legislation*, Providence, 1885, 28; Roy F. Nichols, *The Disruption of American Democracy*, New York, 1948, 440–441; Cox to George L. Converse, printed in *Ohio Statesman*, January 31, 1861.

7 *Cong. Globe*, 36 Cong., 2 sess., 372–377.

8 Cox, *Three Decades*, 67–68.

9 *Ibid.*, 100.

10 David Lindsey, "'Sunset' Cox, Ohio's Champion of Compromise in the Secession Crisis of 1860–1861," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, LXII (1953), 348–367.

> When this war appeared as a speck on the horizon, I pleaded and voted for every compromise. . . . I preferred the bonds of Love to the armor of Force. I found in the sermon on the Mount a wisdom beyond that of Presidents or priests. . . . I hold that . . . it was wisest . . . to agree to any compromise . . . which would have averted these calamaties.[11]

But extremists North and South shouted for action.

When Sumter came, the radicals had so well done their work of arousing passions in the North that Northerners felt a sense of relief that now there would be action to replace the tension of delay and endless words.[12] Mingled with relief, however, was a sense of shame and sorrow that Americans could not settle their differences peacefully by the democratic process of free discussion and compromise rather than by gunfire and bayonets. As Cox put it:

> Could not this Union have been made permanent by a timely settlement, instead of being cemented by fraternal blood and military rule? By an equitable adjustment of the territory this was possible. . . . The Crittenden proposition the radicals denounced. . . . They were determined to prevent a settlement. . . . Those who sought to counteract the schemes of secession were themselves checkmated by extreme men of the Republican party . . . who were "acting out their policy." In the light of subsequent events, that policy was developed. It was the destruction of slavery. . . . Whether a great war with its infinite and harmful consequences was the proper means to such an end, is not for the writer . . . to determine. . . . The historians and philosophers of the future can judge better.[13]

In the initial outburst of martial enthusiasm that greeted Lincoln's call for volunteers in mid-April, 1861, some Northern Democrats joined in whole-hearted support of the administration's decision for war. Other Northern Democrats, however, questioned the rightness, wisdom and expediency of coercing the seceded states, expressing various attitudes of opposition, hesitation, or support with reservations. While remaining a distinct party during the war, the Northern Democracy harbored in its ranks all shades of opinion concerning the war, ranging from outright Southern sympathy through indifference to virtually full support of the war.[14]

Sometimes referred to as the "Peace Democracy," at other times called stronger, less complimentary names like "Sesech-men," Butternuts or Copperheads, Northern Democrats were taunted for their

---

11 S. S. Cox, *Eight Years in Congress*, New York, 1865, 7.
12 Gray, *The Hidden Civil War*, 49.
13 Cox, *Three Decades*, 78–80.
14 *The Crisis*, April 18, 1861; *Ohio Statesman*, April 15, 1861; *Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 17, 18, 1861.

views. Believing that the war came because Northern extremists drove the South out of the Union, but denying the right of secession, they questioned the constitutional right of the federal government to use force against the South. They urged a national convention to adjust differences and drew careful distinction between the national government and the national administration and sought to protect the former against the arbitrary assaults of the latter.[15] Spokesman of the rabid wing of Northern Democrats was Congressman Clement L. Vallandigham. He had coined the catchword, "The Union as it was, the Constitution as it is."[16] Often lining up with Vallandigham stood Ohio's retiring Senator George E. Pugh, and Congressman George H. Pendleton, and Samuel Medary, voluble editor of *The Crisis* and severe critic of the Lincoln administration.[17]

With these men Samuel Cox was on close terms, as Pugh's one-time law partner, fellow Congressman with Pendleton and Vallandigham, and newspaper partner with Medary's son-in-law. Despite the close association, Cox made up his mind reluctantly, but nevertheless certainly, that the use of force, although a calamity, was necessary under the circumstances, but that force should be used for as short a time as possible and should be accompanied by continuous, persistent efforts to arrange a settlement that would re-establish the old Union. Early in March, homeward bound from Lincoln's inauguration, Cox told fellow Congressman William S. Holman of Indiana that "war was inevitable" and "The Union must be maintained at every hazard." He would "cordially" sustain President Lincoln "in every measure deemed necessary and proper to uphold the Federal authority in all the states of the Union."[18]

Although following the general Democratic line, Cox gauged better the demands of the situation and gave the war more vigorous support than did the Medary-Vallandigham group.[19] Perhaps his close friendship with his fellow Brown alumnus, John Hay, gave him a clearer insight into the problems the Lincoln administration faced. Perhaps he was more fully convinced of the necessity of war to reunite the Union. At any rate, Cox's position in support

---

15 Gray, *The Hidden Civil War*, 46–51.

16 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 1 sess., Appendix, 42; 2 sess., 235; Clement L. Vallandigham, *Speeches, Arguments, Addresses and Letters of Clement L. Vallandigham*, New York, 1864, 324–325.

17 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., Appendix, 29, 70.

18 Cox and Northrup, *S. S. Cox*, 88.

19 George H. Porter, *Ohio Politics During the Civil War Period*, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 40, New York, 1911, 133–134.

of the war was accompanied by simultaneous urging of measures looking toward peace. Paradoxical as this appeared to some contemporaries, who charged Cox with political trimming, upon examination, the position seems a reasonable, logical, humane effort to terminate a dispute among fellow Americans by the quickest, most satisfactory means, followed by a restoration of the old order that Americans had known before the war. This constantly recurring theme permeates Cox's activity during the war years. He mourned the changes being made in the old order, opposed the "second American Revolution" he saw taking place and sought means to prevent changes from coming too rapidly and too radically.[20]

Following Douglas's announcement of his support of the administration's war policy, Democratic papers like the *Chicago Times* and Democratic leaders like William A. Richardson shifted from opposition to support of the war.[21] By July 12 even Vallandigham announced that he would now vote for whatever men and money might be needed "to defend the Federal Government."[22] The later elevation of Democrats like George B. McClellan to important army commands no doubt helped effect the change in Democratic opinion.[23]

Douglas's death on June 3 deprived the Democrats of their most dynamic leader. "Who can take his place?" lamented Cox.[24] As the party floundered for a time for want of program and leader, various Democrats sought to fill the gap. Of these, though Vallandigham became most conspicuous, Cox remained closest to Douglas's position and inherited a substantial part of Douglas's mantle. In many ways Cox was like Douglas—small in size, powerful of voice, skillful in political argument. Both held to the supremacy of the Union, popular sovereignty in the territories and its kindred doctrine, state rights regarding matters not clearly within the power of the central government, the necessity of compromise as the essence of the political process—in short, as to the war, a position of critical support, or loyal opposition. In the war years Cox took over as minority leader in the House, a position that Douglas, had he lived, would have held in the Senate.

---

[20] Thomas G. Addison to Cox, July 11, 1861; Robert W. Fenwick to Cox, July 12, 1861; Charles M. Gould to Cox, March 3, July 17, 1861, Cox Papers.

[21] *Cincinnati Enquirer*, May 2, 1861.

[22] Vallandigham, *Speeches*, 324.

[23] *Cincinnati Enquirer*, July 23, 1861.

[24] S. S. Cox, *Stephen Arnold Douglas*, The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 1862.

When the special session of Congress convened on July 4, 1861, Cox received the complimentary Democratic vote for Speaker of the House.[25] Willing to support a war to restore the Union, Cox wanted no more of war than necessary to that end, nor did he want the war used for other purposes, such as strengthening the Republican party, punishing the Southern states or freeing the slaves. "I will vote," he declared early in the session, "what is required to enable the Executive to sustain the Government—not to subjugate the South. . . . I distrust power wherever it is delegated. Its tendency is always to aggrandize itself."[26] After voting euthusiastically for the Johnson-Crittenden resolutions that stated the war's purpose was "to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and . . . to preserve the Union . . . that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease," Cox submitted a resolution of his own. Asserting his aim to end the present "difficulties by rational methods," he proposed that a Northern commission composed of Martin Van Buren, Millard Fillmore, and Franklin Pierce and others meet with a similar Southern commission and work out a settlement. Although voted down by 85-41, this resolution clearly expressed Cox's position on the war—war as necessary, a reasonable compromise settlement as soon as possible.[27]

A firm Democrat himself, "Sunset" Cox had no use for Democrats who joined with the Republican party. In his official eulogy of Douglas, Cox called the latter "a statesman, who, foreseeing and warning, tried his utmost to avert the dangers which are now so hard to repress. . . ."[28] The Democratic party in the North should still seek to "repress" those dangers, however, maintain a separate, distinct organization, and keep a watchful eye on the Lincoln administration. Of his own political activity in the fall of 1861, Cox wrote a fellow Congressman: "I have been busy . . . making my Dist. . . . all right as usual . . . Dem. by increased majorities . . . although the meanest combination of bastard Dems united with this new party to defeat us."[29] At the same time a note to Senator Andrew Johnson suggested that Johnson might want to use

---

[25] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 1 sess., 4–5.
[26] *Ibid.*, 95–96.
[27] *Ibid.*, 331, 448, 458; Edward McPherson, *The Political History of the United States During the Great Rebellion*, Washington, 1864, 286.
[28] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 1 sess., 35–37.
[29] Cox to William H. English, October 23, 1861, William H. English Papers, Indiana State Historical Society Library.

Cox's own 1859 attack on Joshua Giddings against "some extreme Fire-Eater of the South."[30]

During the war years in Congress, "Sunset" Cox sought to preserve the old order or at least rescue as much of it as could be saved from the cauldron of war. This meant adhering to the Johnson-Crittenden resolution's purpose, seeking for an early end of fighting, before the scars of war cut too deep, before rancors became too bitter, while Union sentiment in the South was still widespread and while resuscitation of the disrupted Democratic party was still possible. Therefore, while supporting vigorous prosecution of the war, Cox tried to encourage Southern Unionists by calling for fair treatment of Confederates, quick exchange of prisoners of war, a readiness to end the war by negotiation.

Consequently, he opposed efforts at change, such as emancipation of slaves and raising the tariff level. These, he said, were measures of revolution, not simply restoration of the Union. Using the traditional methods of the minority, he appealed most frequently to that ancient refuge of the minority, state rights under the Constitution. The administration, he held, must be constantly called to a halt when it exceeded its constitutional authority. Eternal vigilance to preserve civil liberties and constitutional guarantees would prevent Congressional leaders from imposing their wills on an unsuspecting people. Representative of the rural, agricultural West, he protested against New England abolitionists and Pennsylvania protectionists and sought to defend agricultural interests by keeping alive the Democratic party, based on a loose affiliation of agricultural West and South of prewar days.

In the fall of 1861, Democrats generally suffered defeat and discouragement. Democratic members of Congress failed to agree on a platform of opposition.[31] Mobs in Ohio destroyed Democratic newspaper offices and broke up Democratic rallies.[32] In the light of these outbursts of violence, Democratic leaders slowly concluded that the best basis for opposition to the administration was an appeal for the defense of constitutional guarantees of individual liberties now under attack—a strategy used by anti-slavery leaders a quarter century earlier in the battle over the "gag" rule in Congress. Democrats now began to charge that the war had been fashioned by the

[30] Cox to Andrew Johnson, October 26, 1861, Andrew Johnson Papers, Library of Congress.
[31] *Cincinnati Enquirer*, October 3, 19, November 1, 1861.
[32] *The Crisis*, August 29, September 12, 1861.

Republicans simply to destroy the Democratic party. Throughout the war variations of this theme were repeated and elaborated in Democratic appeals to the voters.[33]

When the second session of the thirty-seventh Congress met in December, 1861, Cox became active as a goad in the side of the Republican leadership. Employing the time-worn methods of political opposition, he offered dilatory motions, motions to amend, insisted on roll calls, used ridicule and satire in dramatizing the inconsistencies of Republican leadership. He frequently won his points by persistent, skillful parliamentary maneuvering, as minority leader in the House, taking full advantage of any chink in the opposition's armor. At other times, he was serious in using the art of rational persuasion where he felt it would accomplish his purpose.

The exchange of war prisoners especially concerned Cox, particularly since one of his brothers was serving in the Union army. If the uprising were considered strictly a rebellion, captured Confederate soldiers and sailors would logically be considered traitors subject to the death penalty. The practical difficulty blocking execution of this legally correct view was the large number of prisoners captured by both sides. President Lincoln, in his proclamation of a blockade of Confederate ports, had given at least partial legal recognition to the belligerent status of the Confederacy. Even so, the threat was made early in the war to treat Confederate privateers as pirates, subject to the death penalty upon capture. In response, the Confederate government announced that it would retaliate in kind against Northern prisoners if the Union threat were carried out. Cox argued that fellow Americans should avoid measures of such extreme cruelty against each other, even in war. If speedy restoration of the Union were to be achieved and friendly feeling reestablished, cruel treatment of prisoners could not be tolerated.

Early in January, 1862, Cox offered a resolution in the House asking the President what arrangements had been made concerning prisoner exchange.[34] Receiving no answer, Cox called on Lincoln at the White House. The first conference was unproductive, but the Ohio Congressman was invited to call again. He did and later reported on the interview:

"Mr. President, you are endeavoring to put down this insurgent force by force." "Yes." "You desire to keep alive the patriotic sentiment?" "Yes." "The Irish are a martial race. The Sixty-ninth (New York regiment)

[33] *Cincinnati Enquirer*, August 4, 1861.
[34] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., 229.

are Irish . . . Will you discourage them?" "No." "Will not this threat of retaliation and hanging rob the service of some of its best soldiers, and detract from its gallantry and *esprit?*" "Yes" "Well then, Mr. President, if much good and no harm results from relieving our Union officers in durance, South, why not exercise your prerogative?" "Ah, there it is," said the President. "You will have me recognize these pirates as belligerents. Remember that the fight on land is one thing, but on an unstable element like the sea, where men are isolated and helpless is another."

This was then, the sum of the reasoning against the exchange of prisoners. It had in it no element of humanity or international law. The writer then put one more question: "What is the difference between firing a shot at yonder flag (pointing out the White House window to the flag flying from one of the forts on the Virginia hills) from Ball's Cross Roads, where you can almost see the 'stars and bars,' and firing a shot at the same sacred emblem from under the same 'star and bar' bunting upon the mobile element? Are not both shots intended to take the life of the Union? Where is the difference in intent and conduct? Does the difference consist in one being fired on the soil ad the other on the sea? Is it one thing from yonder red banks and another from the blue sea?" The President quizzically pondered a moment over the *ad absurdum,* and then admitted there was no substantial difference. He promised relief. It came. Secretary Seward ordered an exchange of the so-called pirates as prisoners of war.[35]

Cox believed that his intercession on behalf of war prisoners had a large effect upon the President and he counted the early exchange of prisoners one of his personal achievements in helping to mitigate the effects of war. An official exchange agreement with the Confederacy was finally concluded in the summer of 1862.[36]

Cox used humor and ridicule as a weapon of opposition in a major speech in January, 1862, that proved to be one of the most entertaining Congressional performances of the session, offering a defense of General George B. McClellan who was under attack for military inaction.[37] Several House members, notably John A. Gurley of Cincinnati, had denounced McClellan. In reply Cox launched an attack against Gurley for working had in glove with Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton for the general's dismissal.

Commenting on Congressmen as military critics, Cox described the precipitous retreat from the Bull Run debacle in which "Congressmen won the battle . . . against our own soldiers [Laughter]." Cox then pointed to Gurley:

---

[35] Cox, *Three Decades,* 243–244.

[36] James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction,* New York, 1937, 437.

[37] Ben Perley Poore, *Perley's Reminiscences of Sixty Years in the Nation's Metropolis,* Philadelphia, 1886, I, 103.

My colleague after a fatiguing race to Centreville, and having passed that point with the speed of Gilpin . . . was careening along like the devil . . . until luckily he met . . . a herd of stampeded cattle, who were from my own beloved district—Texas cattle, sir, wintered in the Scioto valley, and selected by their drover for their stampeding propensity [Laughter], when, seizing upon the extreme rear of a noble bull, he was borne from the field, holding with vigorous prehension to the tail of the animal! [Great Laughter.] This was Bull Run indeed!

Amidst much guffawing, the Speaker's call for order was met by one member who acknowledged his violation of order, but confessed: "I laughed; but for my life's sake, I could not help it." Cox went on from the "unique performance of my constituent and my colleague" to urge Gurley, a minister of the gospel, to have a little faith in McClellan.

Having thus destroyed Gurley as a military critic, Cox enumerated McClellan's accomplishments, relating how he had saved Washington, retained Maryland, won Virginia's eastern shore and whipped an army of 100,000 undisciplined men into a fighting force. McClellan deserved praise rather than censure for his generalship:

I would prefer that the war should be carried on and ended by bloodless tactics rather than by bloody carnage, if it were possible. I would leave as little hate as possible as the legacy of this conflict. . . . General McClellan is not making this a war of vengeance, but a war for the restoration of the Union. . . . We shall see the Union element in the South dilating and emerging from its despondence.

This last sentence revealed Cox's hope for a speedy end of the war.

As to confiscation and emancipation, if such legislation should pass, "the North will rise to drive the free blacks from their soil and no good will accrue to the black or white." Emancipation "will paralyze the efforts of the army" and "would be an act of fraud on the soldiers." It would change the war into a war against slavery, thereby making it "a gigantic swindle upon the people." The State Legislatures should decide the slavery issue, not Congress. In the face of this "persistent and unreasoning fanaticism," Cox condemned vehemently "that dangerous and horrible malversation of our Congressional office, which would usurp the power of the States over their own institutions."[38]

This powerful speech, printed and later used as Democratic campaign material, brought many a laugh and stirred serious think-

[38] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., 242–249, 569–574; Cox, *Eight Years*, 218–236.

ing about the nature of the war and the outcome that would result from radical persistence in extreme measures like emancipation. Letters in the next few months praised Cox for his damning ridicule of abolitionist Gurley and his stirring defense of General McClellan.[39] One constituent declared the speech had invigorated "dull and desponding" Democrats and urged Cox to "give Abolitionism the devil."[40] Another hoped that Cox would "get Ben Wade tied to the tail of a Jackass and then kick him to death."[41] Ex-Congressman William H. English wrote from Indiana: "Would to God there were more like you in the House,"[42] while Cincinnati journalist Murat Halstead thanked Cox for "a hearty laugh at the expense of Col. Gurley who will probably never more relish ox-tail soup."[43]

By spring, 1862, Cox was "busy, watching the devilish machinations of these Abolitionists here."[44] In April he was paired against the bill for compensated emancipation in the District of Columbia which passed.[45] As the tempo of the fighting increased, so too the temper of politics rose. Radical Thaddeus Stevens in the House continued to press for confiscation of Confederate property and emancipation. In August, 1861, Congress had enacted a confiscation act providing for seizure of all property used for "insurrectionary purposes," a phrase left perhaps intentionally vague. By the next spring a far more sweeping measure was introduced and ultimately passed. It proposed the confiscation of the property of all "enemies," slaves of all persons supporting the rebellion to be "forever free of their servitude."[46]

Cox's lengthy speech on June 3 denounced this proposal. Recalling the Johnson-Crittenden resolutions, he urged the President to "reassure . . . the public mind" as to the purpose of the war. Then, playing on Northern fears of Negroes flooding the North, the Ohioan boldly asked: "Is there a member here who dare say that Ohio troops will fight successfully or fight at all, if the result shall be the . . . movement of the black race by the millions northward to their own State?" Pressing his point home, "I would protest

39 George L. Converse to Cox, February 8, 1862, Cox Papers.
40 Robert Harryman to Cox, January 26, 1862, Cox Papers.
41 Charles Pollett to Cox, February 4, 1862, Cox Papers.
42 William H. English to Cox, February 18, 1862, Cox Papers.
43 Murat Halstead to Cox, February 26, 1862, Cox Papers.
44 Cox to Franklin Pierce, February 24, 1862, Pierce Papers, Library of Congress.
45 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., 1649.
46 J. G. Randall, *Constitutional Problems under Lincoln*, Revised edition, Urbana, 1951, 278–280.

against this ambiguous policy" of professing a war to preserve the Union but actually fighting a war to abolish slavery. As for the cause of the war, Cox argued: "Slavery is the occasion, but not the cause . . . but slavery agitation, North and South, is the cause." War guilt should be shared by both "secession and abolition." Republicans were to be condemned for working "to free the Negroes, regardless of Constitutional limitations and consequences."

Republicans, Cox charged, were changing their attitude on the nature of the war. Where first they had asserted that it was not a civil war, now they were contending that the laws of war between nations should apply and make confiscation possible. Granting, however, that confiscation and emancipation were constitutional and in accord with the law of nations, Cox rested his opposition on "more conclusive reasoning." The question was "the preservation of the people and society of the North." Northern states would not receive freed slaves, even admitting that many "will be freed incidentally by the war." Then, in explanation, Cox offered: "I do not speak these things out of any unkindness to the negro." Rather "I speak as their friend when I oppose such immigration . . . of the free negroes."

Emancipation would benefit, therefore, neither North nor South. The effect in the North would "detract from the prosperity of the community." Returning soldiers would find Negroes in their former jobs and wages depressed. On the other side, with the South's labor system destroyed, "the markets of the South will be closed" and "our prices of corn, wheat, beef, pork, etc., will be reduced. . . ." Thus emancipation would mean "loss to the South and damage to the North . . . and no gain to either." Cox's answer to the problem was "Leave to the States their own institutions" where the Constitution left them, and "keep your faith in the Crittenden resolutions. . . ."[47]

At home in Ohio, Cox's views on emancipation and speedy restoration of the Union won approval from at least one segment of public opinion. Letters from constituents and others praised his work. One wished that Cox were president "instead of that old Rail Splitter and Union Splitter,"[48] while Murat Halstead urged Cox to lead in forming a new party separate from Republicans and Democrats to "ad-

[47] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., Appendix, 242–249; Cox, *Eight Years*, 236–258; *The Crisis*, June 18, 1862.

[48] W. D. Barrick to Cox, April 31, 1862, Cox Papers.

minister the government so as to let the people alone as much as possible and permit the progress of the natural order of things."[49]

Ohio Republican legislators, resenting Cox's obstructionist attacks on the Lincoln administration, proceeded to redistrict the state under the new federal reapportionment act that cut Ohio's Congressional representation from twenty-one to nineteen, redrawing Cox's district so as to make his reelection impossible.[50] George Converse wrote Cox from Columbus: "Every Democrat will vote against any bill that will not save the capital district."[51] The final adjustment of district lines set by Republican leaders aimed primarily at removing both Cox and Vallandingham from Congress. "This deed of infamy," wrote a Cox supporter, "out-Herods Herod. . . . It is a shame and a disgrace."[52] It was little solace to Cox that Democrats in Ohio's legislature gave him their complimentary vote for Wade's seat in the Senate.[53]

Reporting the change in district lines, the *Ohio State Journal* predicted that "Sam Cox . . . an admirable fool killer" would be buried "1500 fathoms deep" in the coming elections.[54] The new district had in 1861 given a Republican margin of 2,200 votes out of a total of 18,000.[55] In the face of this legislative scheme for his retirement, Cox put up a brave front referring to himself as "a prospective constituent of . . . [Samuel] Shellabarger . . . in the new district," which the legislature "has made for my especial contemplation."[56] Before leaving Washington, Cox joined a group of thirty-five Congressmen who under the lead of John Crittenden issued a statement declaring that the Union must be preserved; that the Constitution was paramount to all other considerations; that the army should not fight for any party purpose; and that the war's purpose should remain that stated in the Johnson-Crittenden resolutions of 1861.[57] Here was the platform on which Cox stood for reelection.

August and September, 1862, found Cox campaigning vigorously in his new district. Although condemned by the opposition paper for canvassing while his opponent, former Congressman Samuel

---

49 Murat Halstead to Cox, February 26, 1862, Cox Papers.
50 George L. Converse to Cox, December 17, 1861; William G. Boggs to Cox, March 25, 1862, Cox Papers.
51 George L. Converse to Cox, March 15, 1862, Cox Papers.
52 William Griswold to Cox, April 25, 1862, Cox Papers.
53 *Ohio State Journal,* April 18, 1862.
54 *Ibid.*
55 *Ibid.,* June 30, 1862.
56 *Cong. Globe,* 37 Cong., 2 sess., Appendix, 248.
57 *Ohio State Journal,* July 8, 1862.

Shellabarger, enlisted briefly to help defend Cincinnati, Cox scoffed at this "squirrel campaign" and pointed out that he himself was assisting Colonel H. B. Carrington in securing enlistments along with his campaign for restoring the Union under the Constitution.[58] Hoping to reinforce his emphasis on speedy reunion of the warring sections, Cox invited Crittenden to visit his Columbus home and "give me a speech in this hour of trial" while the fighting raged near the Kentuckian's home.[59] Crittenden declined with thanks but expressed his hope for Cox's election to prevent perversion "of this holy war for the . . . union into a mere antislavery party war."[60]

Many influences added up to defeat the Union party in October, 1862—Waning enthusiasm for a stalemated war with a military draft drawing closer, fear that Lincoln's Emancipation Proclmation changed the war into a crusade to free the Negroes who threatened to flood the North and resentment of arbitrary imprisonment of many newspaper editors that helped underline Democratic charges of despotic disregard of civil liberties.[61] As a result, Democrats captured fourteen of Ohio's nineteen Congressional seats. "Sunset" Cox beat the odds stacked against him in the gerrymander, a 1,600-vote edge in his home county enabling him to squeak through.[62] Apparently more than half the voters of his district approved his advocacy of armed force tempered with offers of conciliation but no emancipation.[63] Soon after the election, rumor had it that Confederate leader Judah P. Benjamin was corresponding with Cox regarding a settlement. A correspondent urged Cox to disavow any connection with Benjamin and quoted Cox regarding as saying he "rejoiced more over the defeat of Vallandigham that of any other candidate for Congress."[64] While Republicans cast about for explanations of their defeat, Cox exuberantly led the Democrats back to Congress, confident that the people had just spoken loudly in favor of his party.[65]

One of the most ticklish problems of civil war is the dilemna wherein the government finds itself pressed to respect civil liberties

---

58 *Ibid.*, August 9, September 12, 1862; Cox, *Three Decades*, 190.
59 Cox to John J. Crittenden, September 23, 1862, Crittenden Papers, Library of Congress.
60 Cox, *Three Decades*, 190; Cox and Northrup, *S. S. Cox*, 9.
61 Abraham Lincoln, *Complete Works*, ed. by J. G. Nicolay and John Hay, New York, 1905, II, 239.
62 *Ohio Statesman*, October 17, 1862.
63 *Ohio State Journal*, October 17, 20, 1862.
64 *Ibid.*, December 6, 1862, January 5, 1863.
65 *The Crisis*, October 8, 15, 22, 1862.

while prosecuting the war. In constitutional theory government is expected to operate under the restraints of law. Where to draw the line between the government's power to defend itself and the individual's right to freedom of action is at best a complex, troublesome matter. To confound the difficulty further during the Civil War, practices branded as "disloyal" were often closely intertwined with agitation designed to embarrass the Lincoln administration and to gain partisan political advantage.

Notably in Ohio and New York, Democrats used the appeal to the rights of free speech, press and assembly to agitate for the end of Republican rule and a negotiated end of hostilities with the Union preserved. To some this latter goal implied an inherent contradiction. Others cynically interpreted this stand as sympathy for the Confederate cause. Early in the war Congress enacted a conspiracies and a treason act providing punishment for disloyal activity, but neither had been well enforced. President Loncoln, proceeding on his own, by executive order suspended *habeus corpus* in specified areas and had directed summary arrest of suspected persons. In September, 1862, he proclaimed that for the duration of the war individuals engaging in disloyal activities would be subject to martial law and trial by military commission. Thousands of arrests were made by the War Department under this directive and offenders jailed without civil trial. Democratic success in 1862's elections in part sprang from popular reaction against this policy.[66]

"Sunset" Cox was outraged by the Republican charge of disloyalty against Northern Democrats. Writing his memoirs years later, he turned the charge neatly against the radicals. "Were they Democrats," he asked,

> who hounded on the war, and then bought Southern negroes to fight the battles in which they would not risk their own lives? . . . . How many abolitionists . . . were hiding from the draft, or paying . . . substitutes? It was such craven creatures as these, who charged Northern Democrats with secession sympathy. . . . By what irony of events was it that these creatures—who were at times more disloyal to a constitutional Union than the most violent secessionists—who wormed themselves and their plots into national affairs, and prolonged the war in which they had no part, except to incite the conflict and fan the flames of passion?[67]

This view, though violently partisan, nevertheless, contained a kernel of truth.

---

[66] Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction,* 387–394.
[67] Cox, *Three Decades,* 221.

As the short session of Congress began in December, 1862, Cox questioned the policy of military arrests by offering resolutions in the House condemning such arrests "as unwarranted by the Constitution" and "as a usurpation of power never given up by a people to their rulers."[68] Although these resolutions died a-borning, Cox announced he would "keep on probing" this "most vital" question of personal freedom because the "Republicans are very much disposed to shirk" it.[69] On Thaddeus Steven's bill authorizing the President to suspend *habeus corpus* and giving officers making military arrests immunity from indictment, the Buckeye Congressman joined twenty-five fellow Congressmen in signing a formal protest.[70] The protest Cox forwarded to Lincoln with a letter asking why Edson Olds, an Ohio editor, was not released from prison.[71] Soon afterward Cox wrote Lincoln urging continuation of arrangements for war prisoner exchange, making it clear that this did "not involve a recognition of the rebels as a Government" but expressing hope for early conciliation between the warring sections.[72]

In mid-December a Cox speech on "The Meaning of the Elections of 1862" blamed the administration for radical rule resulting in a divided Union, a national debt of $2,500,000,000, a tariff paying "millions into the pockets of capitalists from consumers," destruction of "the rights of personal liberty" and the deaths of "at least 150,000 of the best youth of the country." Urging moderation, Cox insisted that the people in the elections just passed had issued a new Ten Commandments:

Thou shalt have no other source of power before you.
Thou shalt not take unto thee any graven image of ebony. [Laughter.]
Thou shalt not take the name of Liberty in vain; for thou shalt not be held guiltless for such sacrilege upon personal and constitutional freedom.
Remember the election days of November . . . to keep them holy. [Laughter.]
Honor the Constitution and the Union, if you would have your days long in the land.
Thou shalt not kill—in vengeance and in vain.
Thou shalt not degrade the white race by such intermixtures as emancipation will bring.

---

68 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 2.
69 Cox to Manton Marble, December 5, 1862, Marble Papers, Library of Congress.
70 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 21, 165.
71 Cox to Abraham Lincoln, December 5, 1862, Robert T. Lincoln Collection of Abraham Lincoln Papers, Library of Congress.
72 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 15.

Thou shalt not steal, nor suffer the money of the people to be stolen by the army of jobbers and contractors.
Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbors, charging them falsely with disloyalty.
Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's servants . . . ; nor tax the people for their deliverance.

These commandments, Cox feared, would be ignored because "too many on the other side have lost their sense of responsibility by losing their offices."

In view of the Emancipation Proclamation, the real purpose of the war, "so long hinted at," was now coming to the fore—abolition of slavery "by Federal legislation and Executive proclamation." This Cox would oppose as unconstitutional unless enacted by the states. The Buckeye Representative maintained that the administration would have to resort to a conservative policy "to adjust the causes of strife and bridge this abyss, below which is surging the torrent of blood." The President would have to return to that key to political achievement found in "this once-honored word—COMPROMISE." "Force may subdue rebellion," Cox argued, "but other means must reconcile the people North and South," and the Union might yet be reunited "in the spirit of Christian brotherhood . . ."[73]

Democrats in Congress continued during 1863 the running fire of opposition with "Sunset" Cox prominent in the struggle to bolck administration action. He continued old themes with new, colorful illustrations: New England's responsibility for the war, the unconstitutionality of emancipation and the picture of the President as an arbitrary despot.[74] Exaggeration and distortion were used to check what Cox considered extreme action on the other side. In February, Cox and his cohorts won modification of the indemnity bill. Although the power to suspend *habeus corpus* was granted the President, military officers were required to furnish names of those arrested to federal judges of the districts in which the arrests were made. If the local grand jury did not find an indictment within a specified time, the judge was to discharge such persons upon their taking an oath of allegiance.[75] Such tactics won Cox the grudging admiration of James A. Garfield who called him one of the "hardest

[73] *Ibid.*, 94–100; *The Crisis*, December 24, 1862; Cox, *Eight Years*, 259–261.
[74] *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 281, 626, 916.
[75] Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction*, 400.

Congressional opponents and critics that any Republican could hope to meet."[76]

Outside Congress, Cox's speech on January 13, 1863, before the Democratic Union Association of New York City attracted public attention and sharp criticism. Speaking on "Puritanism in Politics," the Ohio Congressman denounced the "arrogant, selfish, narrow and Puritan policy" of abolition which "has made the Union, for the present, impossible." War had come because "Puritanism introduced the moral elements involved in slavery into politics." Condemning "republicanism that sustains emancipation" and abolitionism, he contended, "They are two separate links of the same Bologna made out of the same canine original," seeking to "undermine the structure of our society." Hailing the 1862 elections as evidence of a changed public opinion, Cox concluded triumphantly by declaring "the Democracy will . . . fight . . . for the restoration of THE UNION AS IT WAS, but the supremacy of THE CONSTITUTION AS IT IS" in the "healing spirit of mutual confidence and conciliation."[77]

When a new conscription bill moved toward a vote in the House at the end of February, Cox took the floor to defend Democratic loyalty and plead for a return to the original purpose of the conflict, citing the Johnson-Crittenden resolutions again. Accordingly, Democrats were striving to make the war "short and successful." To that end, Cox saw the "present mission of the Democratic party" as engaging in "criticism upon the administration" and remaining "fearlessly vigilant against the encroachments of power." Summing up his party's position: "We are for this Union by war" while war was necessary; "We are for this Union by peace whenever peace is honorable and possible. We are opposed to any war for the abolition of slavery. . . . We are opposed to any peace that will mutilate the Republic. . . ." The proposed conscription bill would "mutilate the Republic," by depriving the states of their constitutional power over their own militia. His own position, Cox felt, had been undermined in the past year. He had in good faith recruited volunteers for the Union army urging men to defend their Union, only to discover that the war was now being fought to abolish slavery. This Cox called "base treachery" to those who had joined the army to preserve the Union. Because of this shift in basic purpose, Cox declared he could "not trust the present Chief Magistrate."[78]

---

76 Theodore C. Smith, *The Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield*, New Haven, 1925, I, 362.

77 Cox, *Eight Years*, 281–301; *The Crisis*, January 21, 1863.

78 *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 1267–1270.

Detained in Washington after the short session by an attack of diphtheria, Cox was disturbed by reports of increased activity by extreme peace Democrats in his home state. Recognizing these as a "large element in our party," he wanted it understood that "we in Ohio of the dominant kind in our party" wanted peace only with a restored Union. He urged editor Manton Marble of the widely-read New York *World* to express this view in "tabooing the Breckinridge element." Such tactics, he thought, would enable Democrats and moderates to control "this House in its next organization" in December, 1863.[79] Encouraging reports reached him from Albany that Governor Horatio Seymour had conferred with Vallandigham and Daniel W. Voorhees, an Indiana Peace Democrat, and had "modified their views" on peace at any price.[80]

The campaign for governor in Ohio had practically begun in January, 1863, when ex-Congressman Vallandigham announced his availability. Campaign material was soon at hand with the destruction of Sam Medary's *Crisis* office in Columbus by a mob of soldiers from nearby Camp Chase on March 5.[81] Democrats saw signs of statewide victory when the local spring elections swung in their favor.[82]

In mid-April General Ambrose E. Burnside, now commander of the Department of the Ohio, issued General Order No. 38 authorizing arrest of those "in the habit of declaring sympathies for the enemy."[83] On May 1 at an all-day mass meeting in Mt. Vernon, Ohio, speeches by Vallandigham, Cox and George H. Pendleton denounced the administration policy of suppressing civil liberties. Four days later Vallandigham, arrested in the bedroom of his Dayton home, was haled before a military commission.[84]

At the hearing Vallandigham denied the commission's jurisdiction and called only one defense witness, Samuel Cox, who had hastened to Cincinnati.[85] On the stand Cox testified that Vallandigham's only reference to Burnside was that "he [Vallandigham] was not there [at Mt. Vernon] by the favor of Abraham Lincoln, David Tod, or General Ambrose E. Burnside," declaring further that he would have noticed any epithets applied to Burnside "because Burn-

79 Cox to Manton Marble, March 11, 1863, Marble Papers.
80 Erastus Corning to Cox, March 13, 1863, Cox Papers.
81 *Ohio Statesman*, March 8, 1863.
82 *The Crisis*, April 8, 15, 1863.
83 McPherson, *History of the Rebellion*, 162.
84 *The Crisis*, May 6, 1863; James L. Vallandigham, *The Life of Clement L. Vallandigham*, Baltimore, 1872, 248–258.
85 Cox, *Three Decades*, 83.

side was an old personal friend of mine." Cox added that he understood Vallandigham's condemnation of the war to be launched at the perversion from the original purpose."[86]

Upon Vallandigham's conviction and banishment, Democrats howled indignantly in protest meetings at Albany, New York and Philadelphia.[87] Cox himself viewed Vallandigham's arrest as the "illegal compulsion of an arbitrary and tyrannical power."[88] The action by the military commission was strictly unconstitutional and illegal, Cox maintained. The Presideit had not suspended the writ of *habeus corpus* in Ohio, and the War Department had not given Vallandigham's name to the federal district court, as required by act of Congress. The President's claim to authority implicit in his war powers, Cox felt, would, if recognized, make the President a "purely despotic" dictator. The civil courts were still open in Ohio. If Vallandigham had done wrong, let him be tried by them. Pointing out that his own views differed from Vallandigham's, Cox argued that Vallandigham was entitled to exercise his right to free speech.[89] The law in the case seemed clearly on Cox's side, as the Supreme Court held in the *Milligan* decision several years later.

Even so, Cox's views were not applauded by all his constituents. The *Ohio State Journal,* for example, referred to "little Sammy Cox" as a "demagogue," while the Philothronean Literary Society of Westerville, Ohio, expelled him from honorary membership.[90] Concerned over his own freedom, Cox rigged up at his bedside in his Columbus home a rope connected to a bell to warn his Democratic friends, "who were averse to a repetition of the Vallandigham outrage."[91] Such concern, however, did not deter the Ohio Congressman from forthright expression of his views, for in an address at Cooper Union in the fall he urged the people to maintain their civil liberty against "all the minions of power."[92]

In June, 1863, the Democratic state convention at Columbus nominated Vallandigham for governor. Cox, disappointed that McClellan was not named, was a familiar figure at the convention, greeting several thousand friends so vigorously he had to have

---

[86] Vallandigham, *Life of C. L. Vallandigham,* 263–283.
[87] *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion,* Washington, 1880–1901, Series II, Vol. V, 654.
[88] Cox, *Three Decades,* 84.
[89] Cox, *Eight Years,* 327–334.
[90] *Ohio State Journal,* June 22, September 8, 1863.
[91] Cox, *Three Decades,* 236.
[92] Cox, *Eight Years,* 335–336.

his hand bandaged.[93] Notwithstanding, at the close of the convention, he was able to compose a long letter to President Lincoln, pointing out that while "my position . . . on the war . . . has not been exactly that of my late colleague," nevertheless, Vallandigham had the "right to comment freely on all the acts of the Administration." He hoped that Lincoln would observe "the rules of fair play" by allowing Vallandigham's return.[94]

Although chosen by the convention as a member of the committee to carry a protest to the White House, Cox did not go to Washington. Instead, in mid-June he addressed the Illinois Democratic state convention at Springfield and shortly thereafter spoke to an audience of "twenty-thousand" in Milwaukee.[95] After a flying trip to New York, Cox continued his agitation for Vallandigham's return. In a letter to Secretary of State William H. Seward, who passed it on to Lincoln, Cox expressed his "faith in your sagacity" and hoped for a "reconsideration" of the case.[96] While stumping northern Ohio, Cox found himself trailed by a military agent. And when Burnside ordered suppression of the outspoken New York *World,* Cox had to make a "private agreement" to secure his copy as "waste paper" discarded by the Columbus post office.[97]

Vallandigham's resounding defeat in the fall election crushed Democratic hopes for the year and bore out Cox's forebodings that Vallandigham did not truly represent the views of the majority of Democrats on the war.[98] Cox felt that the votes of many out-of-state troops in the Ohio election was a decisive factor.[99]

Even before the 1863 elections were over, Cox sought support for his plan to gain working control of the new House for the Democrats, in view of the growing rift between conservative and radical Republicans, and to win the Speakership for himself. Rumor had it that some Republicans might attempt a *coup* to nullify the effects of the Democratic success of 1862.[100] In August, 1863, assured support from Ohio and border state Congressional dele-

---

93 Cox to Manton Marble, June 14, 1863, Marble Papers.
94 Cox to Abraham Lincoln, June 14, 1863, Robert T. Lincoln Collection of Abraham Lincoln Papers, Library of Congress.
95 Cox to Manton Marble, June 27, 1863, Marble Papers.
96 Cox to Seward, June 15, 1863, Robert T. Lincoln Collection of Abraham Lincoln Papers.
97 Cox to Manton Marble, June 1, 1863, Marble Papers.
98 *Ohio Statesman,* October 21, 1863; *Cincinnati Enquirer,* October 20, 1863.
99 Cox to Manton Marble, September 24, October 21, 1863, Marble Papers.
100 E. M. Etheridge to Cox, October 2, 1863, Cox Papers.

gations, Cox asked Charles Lanman, librarian of the House, to "act discreetly at the proper time to aid me."[101] In November he visited New York where he won editor Marble's support for his Speakership candidacy.[102] By late November he was gloating: "I shall be the caucus nominee; and shall combine as much of the Conservative vote as any one."[103]

When the new Congress convened in December, Cox was generally considered the outstanding House Democrat. Nominated for Speaker, he received 42 votes to 101 for Schuyler Colfax. This result left Cox as minority floor leader and member of the key Rules Committee.[104] Heartily enjoying this new responsibility, he gave the Republican majority anxious moments as well as plenty of laughs throughout the session.[105] The Ohioan told John Hay, with whom he dined often, that "it was delightful to be in the minority" but that he was tiring of Washington and would go to Europe after McClellan's hoped-for success in the 1864 election.[106]

Attacking the administration's conduct of the war, Cox early in the session called again for more rapid exchange of prisoners and condemned conscription as "an unrepublican system" of raising troops.[107] In January, 1864, he launched a vigorous denunciation of confiscation as an "utter failure" since it "only stimulates rebellion" and "destroys the last vestige of Union feeting . . . in the South" by using "the weapons of revenge and despair." Besides, confiscation operated as a bill of attainer and was therefore unconstitutional.[108] Cox's cloak of jovial, bantering repartee covered an underlying seriousness of purpose. George S. Boutwell, then a Massachusetts representative, later recalled how a shrewd parliamentary move by Cox had blocked Thaddeus Stevens's effort to get federal reimbursement for Pennsylvania's part in the Gettysburg campaign.[109]

---

101 Cox to Charles Lanman, August 16, 1863, Lanman Papers, Library of Congress.

102 Cox to David Tod, November 3, 1863, letter in private possession, Mrs. James Baily of Zanesville, Ohio; Cox to Manton Marble, November 6, 1863, Marble Papers.

103 Cox to Charles Lanman, November 23, 1863, Lanman Papers, Library of Congress.

104 *Cong. Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., 6–7, 33.

105 S. S. Cox, *Why We Laugh*, New York, 1876, 128.

106 Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, New York, 1936, II, 492.

107 *Cong. Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., 12, 34–35, 70–72, 89.

108 *Ibid.*, 263–264.

109 George S. Boutwell, *Reminiscences of Sixty Years in Public Affairs*, New York, 1902, II, 8–9.

As the months of 1864 rolled by, Democrats, though divided within their own ranks, looked forward hopefully to the presidential election. The extreme Vallandigham peace wing had been held in check by war-supporting Democrats like Cox. By June military stalemate increased dissatisfaction with the Lincoln administration. Extreme Radical Republicans nominated John C. Frémont for president at a Cleveland meeting in May, while Horace Greeley prodded Lincoln to end the war quickly. Even after his own nomination Lincoln despaired to the point of writing at the end of August: "It seems exceedingly probable that this administration will not be reelected."[110]

Chances for Democratic success, therefore, appeared bright, if Democrats could choose the right candidate and avoid the smear of disloyalty. Encouraged by his constituents,[111] Cox was working in early May for McClellan as the strongest possible candidate.[112] Returning to Columbus from a trip East in mid-July, Cox delivered a homecoming speech aimed at "giving McClellan life" and blasting the peace men.[113] Cox derided Lincoln as "this executive trifler; this retailer of smutty stories; this tyrant over men's thoughts, presses, letters, persons and lives" whom "the people in November will damn to an immortality of infamy."[114]

By August 21, 1864, Cox was in Chicago for the party convention. A colonel in Sherman's army wrote urging Cox to get the convention to adopt a "Union war platform" and nominate Grant or McClellan, adding that "every one" of his fellow officers "would vote for him [McClellan]."[115] The convention's choice fell on McClellan, whose nomination Cox heartily seconded. To pacify the peace element in the party, the platform urged immediate peaceable restoration of the Union.[116] McClellan's personal magnetism was counted on to win many voters, while the platform, it was hoped, would keep peace Democrats in line. Early in September McClellan's letter of acceptance emphasized the war's objective as restoration of the Union, rejecting the peace-at-any-price doctrine.

---

110 Quoted in Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction,* 620.

111 W. Borchard to Cox, March 10, 1864, Cox Papers.

112 Cox to Manton Marble, May 2, 14, June 4, 1864, Marble Papers; Cox to George B. McClellan, June 9, 1864, McClellan Papers, Library of Congress; McClellan to Cox, June 20, 1864, Madigan Collection of McClellan-Cox Papers, New York Public Library.

113 Cox to Manton Marble, July 25, 1864, Marble Papers; McClellan to Cox, July 14, 1864, Madigan Collection.

114 *The Crisis,* August 3, 1864.

115 Col. Durbin Ward to Cox, August 2, 1864, Cox Papers.

116 *The Crisis,* August 31, September 7, 1864.

Back in Columbus Cox found that McClellan's acceptance letter had raised "a rousing mess" and some "tall cussing" by Medary and Vallandigham, who had now returned from exile. Even so, Cox thought it might "save the State . . . but don't count big on Ohio," he wrote to Marble. As for himself, prospects looked bleak in the face of a 5,000-vote Republican majority in 1863 in his district. He felt "like a lamb" being led to slaughter and considered turning down the Congressional nomination.[117] By September, however, he couldn't resist the lure of the political arena, accepting the nomination in hopes that with "a fair response from my friends in the Army—I can get through."

The prospects were discouraging. Medary's *Crisis* refused support. Vallandigham Democrats shied away. Cox spent $2,000 of his own savings before sending his brother East with an appeal for funds. From New York financier August Belmont, Democratic national chairman, sent literature, and lawyer Samuel L. M. Barlow at the eleventh hour finally sent $599, but Cox thought it came too late to help.[118] When Cox sought to rally support among soldier-voters at Camp Thomas, near Columbus, he was "driven three or four times" away at the point of a bayonet, and his ballots were not accepted when soldiers attempted to cast them for him.[119] The final tally showed 9,587 votes for Cox to 12,756 for Shellbarger. Gerrymandering and war-time emotionalism were too much. For the first time in his career "Sunset" Cox had lost an election. "This is a sad blow to your friends," wrote Barlow comfortingly from New York, "but it cannot have surprised you very much. The District was too strongly against you, and I have no doubt the admn. made special efforts to defeat your return."[120]

Cox returned to Washington for what appeared to be his last days in Congress, disappointed over his own and McClellan's defeat and discouraged over continuance of the war. But he retained his good humor and lively wit in Congressional debate. His willingness to see the war through was shown in December when he helped

---

[117] Cox to Manton Marble, September 6, 1864, Marble Papers; McClellan to Cox, September 15, 1864, Madigan Collection; Charles R. Wilson, "McClellan's Changing Views on the Peace Plank of 1864," *American Historical Review*, XXXVIII (April, 1933), 498–505.

[118] August Belmont to Cox, September 2, 1864; S. L. M. Barlow to Cox, October 7, 1864, Cox Papers; Cox to Manton Marble, September 20, 23, October 9, 1864, Marble Papers; McClellan to Cox, September 24, 1864, Madigan Collection.

[119] *Congressional Record*, 46 Cong., 1 sess., 1938–1939; Sandburg, *War Years*, II, 569.

[120] S. L. M. Barlow to Cox, New York, October 15, 1864, Cox Papers.

raise volunteers in his home district.[121] However, his concern for ending the war soon remained strong. In January, 1865, he was praising Greeley's efforts to arrange a negotiated peace and introduced resolutions calling on the President to receive or send commissioners to secure an end of hostilities.[122] After the Blair mission to Richmond and the subsequent Hampton Roads conference failed, Cox offered a resolution declaring that the President, in seeking to negotiate, "is entitled to the gratitude of a suffering and distracted country," adding the hope that "the President is not broken down . . . by the fierce onslaughts of his radical adherents" who wanted the war continued for "revengeful purposes."[123]

Regarding emancipation, Cox applied the pragmatic test. Would freeing the slaves further the immediate object of the war—restoration of the Union? Cox thought not and so expressed himself on frequent occasions in the House. Obviously the President could not effect emancipation legally and constitutionally through a wartime proclamation, as Lincoln readily admitted.

When a constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress and passed the Senate in the Spring of 1864, Cox helped block its passage in the House. By the following January when the House began reconsideration of the amendment, Cox's views appear to have modified. Although still holding restoration of the Union more important than abolition of slavery, he was now convinced that the end of slavery was inevitable. Politically, it seemed best to "eliminate the slavery question out of our politics." On a visit to New York in December, 1864, he discussed the question at length with Samuel Barlow, attorney Samuel J. Tilden and Marble "around a table at Delmonico's."[124] He talked also with New York's Senator Francis Kernan and other leading Democrats. "I look upon it as a question of party policy," he wrote Marble. "We must not give the *ne plus ultras* [the extreme Peace Democrats] . . . a chance to rule out the really dominant and salutary influences on our side." If Democrats voted against abolition, "where will it place us?" "Why not strengthen ourselves for the future, by throwing off the proslavery odium?" Democrats must "get rid of the element [of slavery] which ever keeps us in a minority and on the defensive."[125]

---

121 Winfield Scott Hancock to Cox, December 17, 1864, Cox Papers, University of Chicago Library.
122 *Cong. Globe*, 38 Cong., 2 sess., 124–126, 275.
123 *Ibid.*, 617, 665, 734–735, 776.
124 Cox to Manton Marble, December 7, 21, 1864, Marble Papers.
125 *Ibid.*, December 21, 1864, January 13, 17, 1865.

As reports reached Washington that Southerners were freeing their slaves for use in the army, it was clear that the end of slavery would not be a bar to negotiations for a restored Union. And in mid-January rumor had it that the Blair mission to Richmond was about to end in failure. So on January 21, 1865, Cox recorded later, "I fully intended . . . to cast my vote for the amendment."[126] He had explained his position at length several weeks earlier. Conceding the power to amend the Constitution to abolish slavery, Cox preferred to leave the question "to the States individually" because "the amendment will have a tendency toward consolidating power in the Federal head." He had consistently urged a non-intervention policy regarding slavery ever since "I first came to this Congress." Slavery, he declared, "is to me the most repugnant of all human institutions." But the principle of "self-government" by the states over their own affairs was "even more precious than the end of human bondage" because if the federal government could interfere in this matter, then federal interference could be pushed into all domestic matters. Most important of all, however, was the Union. If peace with Union could be achieved "by the abolition of slavery, I would vote for it." But if abolition "is an obstacle in the way of restoring the Union," as Cox felt it was at the moment (with the Blair mission in Richmond), then he would vote definitely against it.[127]

With the amendment scheduled for a vote in the House on January 31, Cox was ready to vote for it for "reasons of party strategy."[128] On reaching the House that day, however, he heard that Confederate commissioners were at General Grant's headquarters ready to negotiate to end the war. Cox tried to find out if this report were true. A note from President Lincoln denied it. But Cox thought "the President ignorant of what was transpiring at General Grant's headquarters." Feeling that the proposed amendment might "prove an insurmountable obstacle" to negotiations, Cox cast his vote against the amendment, despite the fact that he had brought with him a prepared speech explaining his intention to vote for it.[129] The following day Cox expressed regret over his vote: "I did want to vote for that [Thirteenth] Amendment." Shortly afterwards he announced his relief over having the slavery question out of politics.[130]

---

126 Cox, *Eight Years*, 397.

127 *Cong. Globe*, 38 Cong., 2 sess., 237–242; Cox, *Eight Years*, 396–416.

128 Cox to Manton Marble, January 18, 26, 1865, Marble Papers; James Guthrie to Cox, January 22, 1865, Cox Papers.

129 Cox, *Eight Years*, 398; Cox, *Three Decades*, 327–328.

130 Cox to Manton Marble, January 18, 26, 1865, Marble Papers.

Later when William H. Seward asserted that it was "Mr. Cox . . . to whom personally, more than any other member, is due the passage of the constitutional amendment abolishing African slavery," he was referring obviously not to Cox's vote but to Cox's work in convincing other Democrats in the House that the Constitution could be amended in this regard.[131] Some eight Democrats refrained from voting, doubtless due to Cox's pleas. This number would have been able to prevent the necessary two-thirds approval since the amendment passed by a vote of 119 yeas to 56 nays.

With the political career now seemingly at an end, in the face of his 1864 defeat, Cox determined to move to New York City, where four years later he was elected again to Congress to serve with but two short breaks till his death in 1889. Reviewing the first phase of his Congressional career in the dedication of his *Eight Years in Congress,* published in 1865, Cox told his Ohio constituents:

> I represented you truly, when I warned and worked from 1856 to 1860 against the passionate zealotry of North and South; when I denounced, in and out of Congress, the bad fallacy and worse conduct of the secessionists; when I voted to avert the impending war by every measure of adjustment; and when, after war came, by my votes for men and money, I aided the administration in maintaining the Federal authority over the insurgent states . . . I supported every measure which was constitutional and expedient, to crush the rebellion.

Here in his valedictory to Ohio spoke the man of moderate views who had worked in vain to stem the tide of violence and civil war and who was now pushed aside to make way for even more extreme measures than the war had seen. He might have added that he had aided in keeping alive the spark of a constitional loyal opposition in a time of extremes and violence, supporting and defending civil liberty, constantly checking on a war-powered administration and striving to restore the old Union of the pre-war years.

DAVID LINDSEY

Baldwin-Wallace College

---

131 Speech delivered by William H. Seward at Auburn, New York, October 31, 1868, quoted in Cox, *Three Decades,* 274.

Social Aspects of the Alabama Black Belt, 1875-1917

The Black Belt of Alabama is a strip of prairie soil twenty-five miles and less in width that curves from the eastern part of the state across it and into Mississippi on the west. It is bordered on the north and south by the towns of Montgomery, Selma, Linden, Marion, Greensboro, Eutaw, Livingston, Camden, and Union Springs. The characteristic black soil is formed by the mixing of the soft limestone base rock with the humus of the surface. The counties selected here for study are Sumter, Greene, Hale, Perry, Marengo, Dallas, Wilcox, Lowndes, Montgomery, and Bullock, but they include around the Black Belt other sandy and hillside lands not characteristic of the prairie.[1] Black Belters like to think that the culture in the vicinity of the prairie is superior to that in the sandy lands due to the background of plantation "wealth and culture" which presumably existed there prior to the Civil War. Although Negroes far out-number the white people in the Black Belt, their preponderance does not constitute a basis for definition, since there are other sections of Alabama that also have heavy Negro population. The climate of the Black Belt is hot and the summers are long.

Although it was not invaded until late in the Civil War, the Federal armies that appeared there in 1865 and the general wartime drain upon its resources left the region in somewhat the same condition as other sections of the South. Consequently, the results of the war, the burdens of Reconstruction, and the effects of the depression of 1873 left much recovering to be done there at the time our study opens in 1875.

White Migration

A rather general movement of white people from the plantations to the villages, towns, and cities characterized the whole period from 1865 to 1900. While in 1860 the Black Belt contained 12.2 per cent of the white people of the state, in 1900 it contained only 7.5 per cent of them. This was actually a greater proportionate decrease

[1] This is the usage of J. D. Pope, whose conception has become most generally used in scientific works and government reports. J. D. Pope, "Types of Farming Areas," in Alabama State Department of Agriculture and Industries, *Agriculture of Alabama*, Montgomery, 1930, 53 ff.

than that of the Negro population, which dropped from 39.1 per cent in 1860 to 37.5 per cent in 1900.[2] A gloomy picture was painted in 1901 by the *Eutaw Whig and Observer.*

> . . . ever since the war our black belt farming country has been becoming gradually depopulated of white people until today its condition is alarming.
>
> The section of country, forty or fifty miles wide, running across the state, and formerly the home of thrift and plenty, is now almost deserted, or turned over to the unskillful tillage of the negro. As one rides along his eye views miles of land as rich as the land of the Nile, or the equal in everything but improvements of the famous blue grass region of Kentucky with here and there an old mansion built and kept up in the better days, but now going to ruin, or occupied only to be dismantled by the negro tenants. In this section churches, which once flourished, have been disbanded, and the buildings from which the Holy Word has been expounded by eloquent men to cultured and wealthy congregations, are now the homes of goats and hogs and bats. Many of these churches which have maintained their existence are greatly reduced from their former glory. We do not mean to say that all the white people have left this section, but the above is a fair picture of many parts of it and present tendencies indicate that unless some resistance is made to this movement it will only be a matter of time when this will be the condition of the entire section.[3]

Some of the reasons that accounted for this townward movement were fear of Negroes, the inconvenience of country life, the poor prairie roads, and a desire for the company of greater numbers of white people. Many sought better educational advantages for their children, while others sought better church facilities. Some found that they were unable to make a living on the plantation, or else were unwilling to put forth the hard manual effort necessary to run a farm after the war, and so sought the occupations of merchants, business men, or professional men.[4]

Clear evidence of a white exodus is that furnished by the census between 1880 and 1890 when the Black Belt lost 1,502 white people while the Negroes were gaining 6,249 and both white and Negroes in Alabama were gaining in population, the whites increasing by 171,253 and the Negroes by 78,386. The obvious assumption is that a large proportion of these people were responding to the call of the Birmingham coal, iron, and real estate boom which came between 1886 and 1890.[5]

The period 1875–1917 saw the development of numerous small rural communities which served as cotton marketing, ginning, and

---

2 Computed from United States Census Reports, 1860 and 1900.
3 *Eutaw Whig and Observer,* March 7, 1901.
4 *Ibid.,* March 7, 1901.
5 A. B. Moore, *History of Alabama,* University, Alabama, 1934, 525.

trading centers. These prospered until the boll weevil and the coming of good roads and automobiles undermined their reason for being. The exodus of the whites from the plantations left many of the farming areas looking deserted and often desolate.[6]

Beginning in the seventies, the idea of white immigration from other sections of the United States and from abroad was widely publicized. Newspapers advertised cheap lands and the advantages to immigrants of settling in the Black Belt.[7] Leagues to promote white immigration were formed.[8] Railroads, real estate agencies, state governments, chambers of commerce, and other organizations solicited this immigration to the South.[9] It was believed that industrious, thrifty white people would contribute more to the development of the section than the Negroes. Some white people did come as a result of the promotion and propaganda, but few whites wanted to live as farmers in a Negro country. On the whole, the campaign brought meager results.[10]

As the boll weevil approached Alabama, and the realization grew that all had not been well with the cotton system for many years prior, there developed various schemes for rescuing the sinking craft. Besides diversification of farming, the idea of white immigration to the state, already popular, now took practical hold of the people and was manifested, in some instances, in rather bizarre ways. White labor and small farmers were felt to be the great need of the section. The exodus of white planters from the land since the Civil War had left it to "niggers"; and this, it was realized, would never develop the country and never make the Black Belt more prosperous. Lands were often seen lying idle for lack of labor.[11] Yet the Negroes were leaving also, hoping to find better economic opportunities and fairer social treatment in the towns, the cities, and up north.

---

[6] *Eutaw Whig and Observer,* March 7, 1901; *Union Springs Herald,* December 18, 1909; *Montgomery Advertiser,* April 24, 1922.

[7] *Canebrake Herald,* January 14, 1903.

[8] *Montgomery Advertiser,* July 5, 1903, February 3, 1913.

[9] Alabama State Board of Immigration, *Alabama's New Era, 1911–1912–1913,* Montgomery, 1914; *Report of the Commissioner of Immigration of Alabama,* Montgomery, 1878, 3, 5, 6; *Message of George S. Houston, Governor of Alabama, to the General Assembly, Delivered December 28, 1875,* Montgomery, 1875, 21.

[10] Joseph Hodgson, *Alabama Manual and Statistical Register for 1869,* Montgomery, 1869, p. 4; *Livingston Journal,* January 30, 1874; W. L. Fleming, "Immigration to the Southern States," in *Political Science Quarterly,* XX, June 1905, 276–297; *Alabama Opportunity,* Montgomery, 1906, 120–189.

[11] *Canebrake Herald,* January 10, 1907.

In 1903 the Lillietayloe Land Company was advertising for sale to prospective white settlers the "wonderfully rich" lands around Uniontown.[12] In 1905 there were newcomers at Curl's Station in Sumter County, arrived from Tennessee, Kentucky, and Norway.[13] Harry K. White of Birmingham offered 10,000 acres of land in 1910 to promote the immigration movement.[14] Robertson Banking Company of Demopolis advertised in 1911 that it would take the lead in helping farmers to sell their large plantations in small tracts to prospective small farmers.[15]

In Hale County capitalist farmers from western states purchased twenty thousand acres of prairie land to sell in small tracts to their neighbors in the West. In Perry County a Boosters Club was formed among representative business men to "inform the homeseeker" of their "superb" lands.[16]

The *Birmingham News* saw in these cases "evidences of a general movement in the Black Belt to cut up the big plantations and to bring in vigorous, energeteic Western blood."[17] The *News* viewed this movement as partly the outcome of industrial changes in the Black Belt section in the past decade. These changes were largely the result of the exodus of the Negro to the mines and the lumber camps, and resulted in thousands of acres of land in the Black Belt counties being forced into hay and stock raising, while many more thousands lay idle. The *News* felt that the only solution to the problem was the breaking up of the plantations into small farms and the establishment of white villages where once only great open spaces inhabited by Negroes had been.[18]

There were boomlets and promotions in Hale, Sumter, Perry, and Marengo Counties in the period from 1910 to 1916, and there were promoters such as C. C. Clay of Demopolis[19] and Dr. W. J. McCain and T. L. Smith of Livingston, who succeeded in selling lands to northern farmers. The greatest speculative bubble of them all was probably the promotion scheme of Geiger Pinson at Geiger in Sumter County.[20]

---

12 *Ibid.*, January 14, 1903.
13 *Our Southern Home*, October 11, 1905.
14 *Montgomery Advertiser*, December 6, 1910.
15 *Canebrake Herald*, May 26, 1911.
16 *Ibid.*, June 16, 1911.
17 *Birmingham News*, quoted in *Canebrake Herald*, June 16, 1911.
18 *Ibid.*, June 16, 1911.
19 *Montgomery Advertiser*, October 10, 1915.
20 *Gainesville Times*, February 3, 17, 24, 1910; *Geiger Times*, June 30, April 7, December 8, 1910, December 14, 1916.

Although the white immigration schemes were largely failures, still a few families moved into the Black Belt and remained there. Many of them settled in Montgomery County, and scattered here and there throughout the Black Belt were families, sometimes whole communities of "Yankees," westerners, Germans, or others who had found a foothold in spite of the Negro.[21]

Social Conditions

Any adequate discussion of social conditions in the Alabama Black Belt must grow out of the general social pattern and attitudes of the people. Many social situations indigenous to the Black Belt are by-products of its past history and the way of life peculiar to the region. Most obvious and fundamental of the problems of the Black Belt was the one which grew out of its antebellum plantation economy—the Negro and his relations with the whites. About the only sudden revolution which occurred in those relations as a result of the Civil War was that the Negro ceased to be personal property. Most other changes have come as gradual adaptations to this fact. White planters and their families, as soon as the ordeal of Reconstruction was over, continued to depend upon the Negroes for much of their manual and domestic labor. Stories of old ladies who could not dress themselves, and others who, in their poverty, would sneak out at night to sweep their front "galleries" illustrate the sway which ante-bellum mores retained over the people long after the Civil War. No doubt the hot climate contributed to the retention of plantation mores, but the presence of the Negro and the old customs were the determining factors. That such a society should find its recovery slow and arduous is not strange. That the Negroes remained in their rural ignorance and squalor is explained by that condition. Not until after 1900, and especially after the coming of the boll weevil and World War I was the Black Belt Negro forced to seek other means of livelihood than that of cotton tenancy.

Typical of the impression which the Black Belt made were the remarks in 1890 of Miss Julia S. Tutwiler concerning the town of Livingston:

> If you can only wake up this little town to a realization of their indifference to their own interests, you will do a great work.... Every stranger who comes here expresses the same opinion as to the possibilities

[21] *Montgomery Advertiser*, July 30, 1914, October 24, November 25, 1915, March 25, 1919; *Hayneville Citizen–Examiner*, June 10, 1915; *Marion Times–Standard*, October 16, 1924.

of our little town, if only the citizens would rouse themselves and emulate those of other places.[22]

Another deterrent to Black Belt economic progress was the assumption of aristocratic lineage or "blue blood" on the part of descendants of ante-bellum planters, and the efforts of those who could not claim such lineage to attain a status of social recognition by those who did. Aside from the errors of such claims, the general effect of a social system which emphasized pride of ancestry rather than personal achievment was to discourage the sort of "Yankee" energy and ingenuity which had contributed to the prosperity of other sections.[23]

Although the state government was wrested from the control of carpetbaggers and Negroes in 1874, the county governments of the Black Belt remained under such control until about 1880.[24] Negroes, however, continued to vote until the Constitution of 1901 accomplished the practical disfranchisement of most of them.[25] The mores of slavery and Reconstruction continued to govern the attitude of white people toward the Negroes.[26] If there was a mellowing and relaxation of these mores, the process was gradual over the years, if not imperceptible. As long as there was no disturbance or challenge of the white man's supremacy, the outward relations of whites and Negroes seemed placid enough. When some act of aggression on the part of a Negro toward a white person released the delicate tensions, explosions of mob violence often resulted.[27]

White people assumed that Negroes were ignorant, immoral, dishonest, lazy, inefficient, credulous, violent, and superstitious. They were generally poor.[28] Some communities, however, "gave the dogs their dues" by saying that their Negroes were agreeable and

---

22 *Livingston Journal,* October 7, 1890.

23 *Ibid.,* March 14, 1890; *Gainesville Dispatch,* June 5, 1875.

24 W. L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama,* New York, 1905, 795, 796, 798.

25 Constitutions of Alabama of 1875 and 1901, in *Code of Alabama, July 27, 1907,* vol. III, *Criminal,* Nashville, Tennessee, 1907, Article VIII, Section 178 ff, pp. 129 ff.

26 *Linden Reporter,* January 4, 1889; *Marion Commonwealth,* May 20, 1875. Whipping continued to be considered a legitimate form of punishment for many years after the Civil War. W. K. Smith, Livingston, Alabama, to Steve Smith, Lincolnton, North Carolina, July 30, 1875 (E. D. Smith Collection, State Department of Archives).

27 Lynching information is given later.

28 *Livingston Journal,* October 24, 1873, January 23, 1874; Augustus Benners' Diary, entry of January 1, 1867; *Colored Citizen,* April 5, 1884; *Marion Standard,* March 2, 1887; *Hayneville Examiner,* May 10, 1882; J. T. Milner, *Alabama: As it was, as it is, and as it will be,* Montgomery, Alabama, 1876, 159.

law-abiding.[29] The economic status of most Negroes in the years after Reconstruction may never be intimately known, but it must have been extremely low in most cases. Overcrowded one and two-room cabins with leaky roofs, and a diet of meat, meal, molasses, and turnip greens—these were typical of their home life. Immorality, violence, rhythm, religious emotion, laziness, subservience to white people, and illiteracy—these their apparent traits. Familiar activities in the lives of rural Black Belt Negroes included rides on horseback, wagon trips, Saturday afternoons in town, long walks through the country day or night, and farming.[30]

A majority of the Negroes in town and in country lived in miserable shanties and hovels, many of which had cracks in the walls and floors. The members of the family crowded into their small quarters at night without the means to observe personal privacy. Fire, food, and raiment were insufficient. Actually very few of the Negro women were good cooks, for the rations served in their own homes were usually sodden, unappetizing, indigestible, and this poor cooking contributed as much as deficiency of the food toward the general malnutrition from which many of them suffered.[31]

The women who did not work as domestic servants or field hands frequently washed clothes for white people. They "toted" the bundles of clothes home on their heads, scrubbed them and ironed them, and then walked back, the laundered clothes skillfully balanced aloft. Remarking on the drudgery of the colored women, a teacher at Tuskegee said, "It is safe to say that three-fourths of the colored women are over-worked and under-fed, and are suffering to a greater or less degree from sheer physical exhaustion."[32]

Not all Black Belt Negroes were this primitive. There developed a higher class, especially in the towns. A study by W. E. B. DuBois in 1899 of thirty-three better class Negro families in Marion revealed:

> The average family size was 5.3. A noticeable lack of young people between the ages of twenty and thirty, as so many had left town in search of work. Most of the thirty-three selected families owned their homes. Among the mass of the Negro population there were a number who owned their homes. Most of the Negroes lived in two-room houses, a few in one-room cabins. Of the thirty-three better class families, seventeen lived in

---

29 *Wilcox Progress*, September 11, 1889; *Marion Commonwealth*, January 21, 1875.

30 *Minutes of the Fourth Annual Session of the Alabama State Teachers' Association, Marion, Alabama, 1885*, Hampton, Virginia, 1886, 3–8.

31 *Ibid.*, 3–8.

32 *Ibid.*, 3.

three-room houses, eight in four-room houses, and four in five-room houses. Only two of the selected families lived in houses as few as two rooms.

Among the males of the thirty-three families, there were seven farmers, six ministers, five barbers, five carpenters, four bakers, two clerks, two teachers, one mail agent, one drayman, one government employee, one missionary, one plumber, one porter, one sailor, one nurse, and one gardener. Among the females there were seven teachers, two nurses, two cooks, one merchant, one seamstress, and one washerwoman.

Two blacksmiths averaged three to five dollars per day. There were two Negro barber shops, the only ones in town. There were two grocery stores, and a large bakery with a half dozen or more employees, a very successful business. One of the Negro merchants not only owned his store, but also rented apartments to a white merchant. There were several carpenters, masons, and other artisans who earned $1.50 to $2.50 per day.

Most of the colored people were farmers, laborers, and servants. The farmers, as a rule, owned their own farms, but they were not generally very successful. They did not seem to know how to manage and economize. The young women washed, cooked, and nursed. The young men were mostly porters, waiters, and farm hands. They received very small wages and spent much of their wages for dress.

Compared with the surrounding county, Marion had good school facilities and consequently a more favorable rate of literacy. Of the 135 persons fifteen years of age or over in the selected families, thirty-four were illiterate. Only one of these illiterates, however, was under forty years of age. The public school was poor, but there were three missionary schools, one of which, under the American Missionary Association, was very efficient.

There were four churches in Marion—Methodist, Baptist and Congregational. [33] The first two originated in slavery times and were for a long time branches of white churches. The Congregational Church was thirty years old, and the more intelligent Negroes attended it. The majority of the thirty-three families were members. There could be distinguished among Marion Negroes three rather clearly differentiated classes—the upper class studied; the mass of laborers, servants, and farmers, who were usually good-hearted people, but not energetic, nor always strictly moral; and finally the slum elements, among whom sexual looseness, drunkenness, and crime were prevalent. A large number of young people drifted into this lowest class, some who were intelligent and well reared. Poor home life was considered responsible.[34]

William P. Councill, colored president of the Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes at Normal, Alabama, denounced the "coon" songs which tended to belittle his race and the type of lazy, crap-shooting, "cake-walking" Negro who invited the aspersions of the white people.[35]

---

[33] Two of the same denomination, apparently.

[34] Not entirely quoted, but edited from W. E. B. DuBois, "The Negro in the Black Belt," *Bulletin of the Department of Labor*, No. 22, May, 1899, 411–413.

[35] *Eutaw Whig and Observer*, January 12, 1905.

The white people's opinion of Negro morality and their actual morals could be two different matters. Where, however, opinions are widely held, there likely are some grounds for them. The occurrence of considerable violence among Negroes was generally assumed. Fights, shootings, cutting scrapes at social gatherings and even at church services were not uncommon. Incidents of violence against white people were, of course, quite infrequent as compared to those among the Negroes themselves. Even these, no doubt, diminished as the Negroes came to accept white supremacy.

That a Negro would steal was proverbial. Perhaps the Negro was only sharing the wealth as was indicated by the common phrase "spilin' de gypshins." Nevertheless, the white people considered many of them as common thieves and scoundrels.[36] The widespread filching, often in conjunction with carpetbaggers, during Reconstruction days was mentioned by Fleming.[37] Much farm produce was being stolen around Union Springs in the winter of 1871. A bill was introduced in the legislature providing that no produce should be bought, bartered, exchanged, or delivered except between sunrise and sunset.[38] The stealing of cotton seed by Negroes to sell to the oil mill agents was reported at Eutaw in 1884.[39]

Negro parties were often noisy and hilarious and sometimes ended in violence. In Selma the night of July 4, 1894, the Negroes were having an "old time cake cutting." When supper was announced, they were all having a merry time. Two young "bucks" became involved in a row, and the whole gathering became involved in a fight. "When the smoke cleared," one was "cut up into sausage meat," and one or two were "riddled with bullets." Those who came out whole were not seen or heard the next day.[40] These are only stray cases that happened to get into print. How many actual ones occurred can only be guessed. The number of such incidents coming directly to the attention of white people probably diminished as the period progressed. The confirming and tightening of white control brought respect for white people more and more firmly into the social habits of the Negroes. While offenses of Negroes against Negroes continued unabated, they were of a minimum concern to the whites.

For a long time after the acquisition of freedom, there was much

---

36 *Marengo News–Journal,* June 13, 1874.
37 Fleming, *Civil War,* 769.
38 *Union Springs Herald and Tribune,* January 25, 1871.
39 *Eutaw Whig and Observer,* April 24, 1884.
40 *Selma Morning Times,* July 7, 1894.

loose sex life among the Negroes. Women had children by various men, while men might maintain several establishments and have great numbers of children. All sorts of wild sex capers occurred in the various quarters. There was much illegitimacy, and children might go by either the father's or the mother's name. There were cases of white men cohabiting with Negro women. How widespread was this practice would be very difficult to determine.[41]

Complaints of Negro vagrancy found their way into the newspapers. The number of Negro men who loafed on the streets without apparent means of support was supposed to have a direct connection with the number of house servants and cooks who "toted" food from the kitchens of their white mistresses.[42]

Superstitions were widespread among the Negroes, probably in proportion to their isolation, ignorance, and illiteracy. There was a superstition built around every article with which the Negro came in daily contact.[43] Among the Negro settlements of the Tombigbee River, in the decade following the Civil War, the "cunjer man" attained a position of importance. In more recent years the "cunjer man" wore a long tailed Prince Albert coat that showed signs of having been in use for many years. "With eyes of burning sensuality, uncombed hair, shoes tied on his feet with white laces"—he spread his gospel. Boasting that he had never been to school a day in his life, in a "reassuring voice he dogmatically asserted his God-given power to heal all manner of disease—he, who introduced himself as the Reverend Doctor. . . . A cow lowing early in the night, a whippoorwill calling at midnight, a screech owl crying near the house, a moaning dove, or a picture presaged the coming of death."[44] Weather superstitions, funeral superstitions, and many others too numerous to mention plagued the mind of the ignorant rural Negro.[45]

---

41 R. D. Spratt, "History of the Town of Livingston, Alabama" (MS in Livingston Public Library, Alabama, n.d.), from section entitled "Corrections, Additions, Etc.," page not numbered. A study in 1930 of a Black Belt community in South Macon County indicated widespread and complicated mixing of families, desertion, mother and grandmother control of families deserted by fathers, and other family irregularities. No doubt considerable loyalty to the monogamous family has developed among the better classes, but for many Negroes, sex has continued to be a rather promiscuous indulgence.

42 *Alabama Beacon,* October 25, 1873; *Eutaw Whig and Observer,* January 22, 1880.

43 "Negro Folklore," MS in Federal Writers Project, WPA (State Department of Archives).

44 "Folk Songs," MS in Federal Writers Project, WPA (State Department of Archives).

45 *Ibid.*

And many white folks were not above repeating if not believing some of these superstitions.

Black Belt white people have been extremely reluctant to admit the Negroes could ever become respectable, intelligent citizens on a plane with the whites.[46] Since the mores of the region bound the Negro to a lower social caste, it no doubt eased the white conscience somewhat to feel that the Negro was incapable mentally of any higher aspirations. It is true that the great bulk of Negro humanity that remained in the Black Belt never attained a very high economic status. Yet some Negroes, in spite of the overwhelming odds against them, did acquire professional or business positions comparable to those of whites. Some of these exceptional cases are the following.

L. L. Burwell, M.D., passed his state medical examinations in 1889 and built a successful medical practice and drug business in Selma.[47]. A. H. Curtis of Marion was elected to the General Assembly of Alabama in 1870 and to the state senate in 1872. He was the only colored man ever to preside over the senate of Alabama. He was connected with the legislature of Alabama for eight years, and was reputed to have the respect of his fellow legislators of all parties and to have closed his legislative service with growing confidence in his integrity.[48]

M. Archer was a graduate of Selma University, an ordained minister, and principal of the Auburn City School.[49] Joseph C. Barker was employed at the Monarch Book Company of Chicago in a financial capacity, and was a talented artist.[50] E. L. Blackshear of Montgomery became a principal of the Prairie View State Normal School and Industrial College of Texas.[51] Reverend William R. Pettiford, D.D., was not only a valued minister and teacher, but he was also president of the Alabama Penny Savings Bank.[52] Dr. A. F. Owens, Dean of Selma University, had been editor of the Baptist Leader, pastor of a Uniontown church, and was founder of the colored Old Folks Home in 1900.[53]

---

46 *Linden Reporter*, January 4, 1889.
47 C. O. Boothe, *Cyclopedia of the Colored Baptists of Alabama*, Birmingham, 1895, 125.
48 *Ibid.*, 132.
49 *Ibid.*, 114.
50 *Ibid.*, 115.
51 D. W. Culp, *Twentieth Century Negro Literature*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1902, 335.
52 *Ibid.*, 469.
53 Historic Records Survey, "Wilcox County, Alabama", WPA, (State Department of Archives).

By 1901 Tuskegee Institute graduates were scattered at various points in the Black Belt in positions of usefulness or business advantage. Hemmie Pierce was a milliner, Ida Abercrombie a teacher in the Swayne School, Stephen C. Shepard a letter carrier with the Montgomery post office, A. C. Perdue and his brother were contractors and builders in Montgomery, and A. J. Wood was a general merchant at Benton, who had a good trade and the respect of the community.[54]

There were in Union Springs in 1917 two thriving colored physicians, who owned their own drug stores, and also a young colored dentist. There were a colored school principal, county farm demonstrator, a real estate dealer.[55] Eight Montgomery Negroes received commissions as first and second lieutenants at the Officers' Training Camp at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, during World War I.[56] T. J. Jenkins was the state supervisor at Montgomery of the Atlanta Mutual Insurance Company, which had about 7,000 members in the Montgomery District.[57]

In Montgomery in 1920 were six colored physicians and surgeons; one eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist; two dentists; and one veterinarian. There were four Negro drug stores, four Negro undertaking establishments, and a Negro hotel.[58] An Alabama State Negro Business League was revived in 1920.[59]

Striking contrasts were evident in the type of Negro newspaper published in Montgomery in 1886 and in 1917–1920. *The Colored Citizen,* a Montgomery paper of 1886, was strongly political in tone, aggressive in demanding rights for the Negro and in exposing injustices done them by the white race. Crude in physical make-up, in writing style and grammatical construction it bordered on the ignorant. It seemed, however, to report the daily activities of the local people. *The Emancipator* of 1917–1920 strongly imitated the journalistic efforts of the white papers—probably because of the training of its editors. The appearance was attractive. The policy seemed to be to present successes achieved by Negroes with approval and pride, to urge legal justice for the Negro, and to seek by peaceful means cooperation between the races. The editorials were not

---

54 M. B. Thrasher, *Tuskegee, Its Story and Its Work,* Boston, 1901, 139 ff.
55 *The Emancipator,* October 13, 1917.
56 *Ibid.,* October 20, 1917.
57 *Ibid.,* October 13, 1917.
58 *Ibid.,* January 10, February 28, 1920.
59 *Ibid.,* January 24, 1920.

belligerent. There was no effort to disclose injustice done the Negro. The paper sought, on the other hand, to show to Negroes the progressive steps toward justice made by the white people.[60]

By 1920 there was operating from Tuskegee Institute an extension service among the Negroes. Home demonstration agents, mechanical and agricultural instructors, and rural nurses worked in connection with a project known as the movable school to aid rural Negro farmers and their wives.[61]

From the time that slaves were freed, the problem of the treatment of Negroes was uppermost in the minds of most whites. The preponderance in numbers which the Negroes enjoyed added to the bitter experiences of Reconstruction had imparted to this problem an emotional or "touchy" quality which discouraged any compromise in matters relating to white supremacy. The attitude of the whites was a social one, even more than a physical or health consideration. The necessity to maintain white social dominance over the Negro was the primary consideration. The subtleties by which this was accomplished sometimes proved bewildering to an outsider. A Negro physician, lawyer, preacher, or teacher, however competent, might never minister to a white person, because that would imply social equality. Yet as nurses, cooks, house girls, yard boys, and in other servile capacities, Negroes associated on the most intimate terms with white people. If Negro diseases were communicable, certainly there was no better opportunity to pass them on to the whites than as a cook. "Keeping the Negro in his place" became one of the chief social objectives of white Black Belters. White people were usually willing to be generous to Negroes as long as the essential basis of white supremacy was not threatened. A kindly paternalism governed the relations of a large portion of whites and Negroes. Wages for Negro labor were low, but it was understood that gifts, hand-me-downs, and "totin' " would supply much of the deficiency. White planters often complained that the Negro was very clever in extracting contributions and loans from them, and that the planter frequently profited less than the Negro from their relationship. The whites often manifested kindly, helpful behaviour toward industrious, "good" Negroes as long as white supremacy was not threatened.[62] The impudent or violent ones were much complained of and often received severe treatment. The whites were very suspicious of any-

60 *The Colored Citizen,* 1886; *The Emancipator,* 1917–1920.
61 *The Emancipator,* June 26, 1920.
62 *Selma Weekly Times,* April 27, 1881. These are all matters easily documented from personal experience.

one who might arouse the Negroes to rebellion.[63] Negro life was considered cheap by white Black Belters, and Negro death or misfortune was generally taken quite casually.[64]

Negro servants, as a class, were considered incompetent and unreliable.[65] Fear of Negro discontent was reflected in such statements as "There is something going on in the kitchen" or "That talk in my kitchen has got to stop. They need straightening out."[66] An occasional complimentary reference to a "darkie" would likely include not only his diligence and faithfulness but also the fact that he "stays in his place." On the other hand, the white people, especially the women housekeepers, were usually dependent upon the Negro for much of the physical work that was done. This was true of all except the very poorest whites, since Negro labor was cheap and the stigma of white work was great.[67]

James E. McCall, blind Negro editor of the *Colored Servant Girl,* held a somewhat unique view of Negro labor:

> There is not a colored servant girl in America, to whom I would not tip my hat as conscientiously as to a queen. . . .
>
> Day after day, with courageous hearts, these women plod to and from their work, thru wind, rain and snow, they sing in the nursery and sweat over the kitchen fire, that their own babes might have bread. . . . We should not measure them by the rigid standard of other women who are protected and encouraged by wealth, power, nationality, and have no such struggles to wage. We should measure them by their own great standard—the standard of heroism.[68]

McCall founded his Colored Servants' Association and his monthly paper in 1910 to help solve the problem of both the colored servants and their mistresses. His organization acted as an employment agency, certifying suitable servants to employers. At the same time it gave helpful advice and practical aid to the servants in adjusting to their jobs. The *Montgomery Advertiser* in commending the life and work of James E. McCall stated that the *Colored Servant Girl* "contains more common sense to the square inch regarding house service work than anything so far attempted by Negroes. The whole

---

[63] *Hayneville Examiner,* May 3, 1883.

[64] Marion *True Democrat,* October 31, 1883; Selma *Morning Times,* October 18, 1890.

[65] *Union Springs Herald,* October 5, 1887; *Marion Standard,* October 22, 1890.

[66] Anne Kendrick Walker, *Tuskegee and the Black Belt, A Portrait of a Race,* Richmond, Virginia, 1944, 79.

[67] Personal observation.

[68] *Colored Servant Girl,* Montgomery, July, 1910.

aim of the publication is to point to Negro girls that their best results are gained through neatness and loyalty and that good work gets far more consideration than the reverse." McCall circulated his paper for a time at his own expense.[69] Apparently his admirable effort was not a financial success, since the records are available only for 1910.[70]

McCall threw new light upon the problem of Negro dishonesty:

> The dishonesty of the average colored servant can hardly be called dishonesty, and is due largely to the ethical teachings which his ancestors learned in the School of Slavery: They belonged to ol' Massa; hence, when a slave stole a chicken he was simply putting Massa's things together. The dishonesty of the average colored servant is like that of "Jean Val Jean." He does not steal by wholesale. He simply steals a loaf of bread or some other trifle, with which to drive the gaunt wolf of hunger from his door. It is the skillful financier indeed who can feed, clothe and house herself and her family, honestly, on the small wages of a couple of dollars a week. I know a cook, for example, who pays four dollars a month for house rent, and earns only five dollars, yet she keeps fat and wears good clothes.[71]

On the question of Negro reliability, McCall had this to say:

> The white public complains that the present generation of Negro servants are not so faithful and reliable, as the old slave servants, who are fast passing away. This is unquestionably true, but why . . . . What credit does the average negro servant get for being reliable? . . . Few servants of any race will bother themselves about being reliable, in the face of such inappreciation as this. . . .[72]

In discussing the carelessness shown by white people in hiring servants, McCall said:

> Any person who will take the trouble to investigate, will find colored domestics in active service, who ought to be in hospitals. In my own experience, I have seen them with cancers and running sores . . . and syphilis.[73]

Concerning immorality of servant girls, McCall was comparably charitable:

> No other women on earth are so exposed to the evils of the world and so unprotected as these. Forced in many cases to earn a support for themselves, and their families, trudging to and from their work, before daylight and after dark, it is no wonder that some of them fall . . . . Driven to desperation by landlords and money lenders, and earning only a scanty wage

---

69 *Ibid.*, September, 1910.
70 *Ibid.*, July, August, September, 1910.
71 *Ibid.*, September, 1910.
72 *Ibid.*, September, 1910.
73 *Ibid.*, September, 1910.

at best, many a colored domestic who might otherwise be virtuous and temperate, turns to immorality for refuge, and seeks to forget her troubles by the use of Opium, Cocaine and various other drugs and intoxicants of more or less demoralizing nature.[74]

The Emancipator, Montgomery Negro paper, stated in 1920:

From time to time we see many hopeful indications from the better element of white people of the South that a strong public sentiment in favor of a fuller measure of justice and protection for the Negro is gradually being formed in this section. All we ask are the things that we are justly entitled to, and while we are still denied many of these fundamental things, we believe that the day is fast approaching when public sentiment will demand that the Negro be given justice and a square deal.[75]

Such an attitude was in marked contrast to that of a Negro writer in the *Colored Citizen* of 1884:

Just before last new years day, myself [sic] and some other gentlemen went to the Advertiser office for the purpose of having the new years calls of our ladies published. We offered money, but it was refused on the grounds that we were negroes, and that such publication would insult the patrons of that paper.

We are sorry to say, but we somewhat agree with the Advertiser.... Very few colored people read the Advertiser, and those who read it never look for any good things. They read it to find out how near they resemble a mule or a hog, or how many or what ones are in jail.[76]

The attitude expressed in the *Emancipator* also contrasted with that shown in another Negro newspaper, the *Montgomery Herald* of April 2, 1887: "Give us an administration that will not allow men to be shot down like mad dogs, and you may have all the offices."

Harry Harrison Kroll reported happy relations between yeoman white farmers and Negroes in south Marengo County about 1910:

The entire family [white] worked in the field, hoeing. With them worked the white hired man and three Negroes, also hired, but by the day.

. . . . . .

Liela, Lasses, and Jeems, Negro hired hands, finished eating in the kitchen. Miss Lucretia had piled their plates high.

. . . . . .

It is interesting to recollect how well the white and black people got along in the neighborhood. We never had any race problem around the Crossroads [Dixon's Mills]. Nobody ever asked the darkies to treat the whites any better than the white people treated one another, and the blacks

74 *Ibid.,* September, 1910.
75 *The Emancipator,* Montgomery, February 28, 1920.
76 Letter to the editor, *Colored Citizen,* April 12, 1884.

never thought, I guess, of social equality. There's never been a mob in our country.[77]

Possibly many of the Black Belt's difficulties were explainable on the basis of the old saying: "The white man leans on the nigger, and the nigger leans on the white man, and they both just stand there leaning."[78]

Lynching

Lynchings were sometimes committed in the Black Belt, although they were not common. Between 1883 and 1891 there occurred within the ten counties either one lynching or none each year, but during the depression period of 1892 to 1897 the number greatly increased. In 1893 alone ten persons were lynched in the Black Belt, and during the six years there were thirty-three lynchings in the section. After 1898, however, the number returned to the former norm of one, two, or none each year, through 1920.[79]

The lynching record of the South and the nation has gradually improved until today the problem is only an occasional one. Alabama's record paralleled somewhat that of the Black Belt.[80]

The offense which most often raised the ire of lynchers was murder. Rape figured next most often, and arson, being a desperado, sheltering a murderer, poisoning mules, attempted murder, burglary, insulting a woman, threat to kill, making threats, killing an officer, incest, and attempted rape were given as causes. Only five of the Black Belt's sixty-eight recorded lynchings were of white men.[81]

GLENN N. SISK

Georgia Institute of Technology

---

77 H. H. Kroll, *Waters Over the Dam*, Indianapolis and New York, 1944, 13 ff., 23, 45.

78 Source unknown.

79 There were three lynchings in 1901, three in 1919. From 1920 to 1941 there were only three lynchings in the Black Belt. Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama, Department of Records and Research, Statistics on Lynchings, 1882–1945.

80 *Ibid.*

81 *Ibid.*

An Episcopal Contribution to History

In an historical review nearly twenty years ago Monsignor Peter Guilday pointed out that valuable contributions to the study of history had been made by the American hierarchy. In his article "Historians of the American Hierarchy" the late "dean of American Catholic historians," starting with John Carroll's *Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America* found over forty prelates of our country who had added pages to the annals of America. Some collected research materials, some exploited them, some were part and parcel of the events that are now history. Now, the trails earlier blazed in a tangled forest of historical materials, have been opened in many instances into wide roads that newcomers may follow until side lanes may be chosen for exploration. The American Episcopacy is now keenly aware of the need of sound historical study, and priests are regularly withdrawn from parochial work by bishops for special training in history, library science, and management of archives.

Clearly, accurately written history must go to the roots of events in the written records of earlier days, and the achievements of the Catholic Church in the United States will be known and appreciated only when archival material becomes more available for studies of missionaries, churchmen, and laymen who were locally important. Each year parochial archives become more vital as researchers pry into them for details to fill out the general picture. Scholars are ever happy on finding treasures of the past well kept and are ever ready with praise for those who foresaw their needs. Notable for gathering and preserving this warp and woof of history is the present Bishop of Amarillo, Texas, the Most Reverend Laurence J. Fitz-Simon, D.D. Appearing first as a lifesaver for a small collection of Texas Catholic records the bishop has in time expanded these holdings far beyond anything conceived in the beginning.

The story commences with the annual meeting of the Texas Council of the Knights of Columbus at Austin in May, 1923. Not satisfied with having the official proceedings of the yearly gatherings printed, the members of this state convention authorized the foundation of the Texas Knights of Columbus Historical Commission, whose objects were to gather and to exploit data pertaining the

colonial and republican periods of Texas. The Reverend Paul J. Foik of the Congregation of the Holy Cross became the chairman and vivifying genius of the Commission. The records as collected were housed in St. Edward's University, Austin, where Father Foik was a member of the faculty.

The material assembled was soon put into use. Beginning in 1928, a series of historical essays were published in booklet form under the general title of *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society.* Printed in both English and in Spanish, all of these monographs pertained to Catholic history in the Southwest, mostly when it was under Spanish dominion. A larger project, also founded on the historical documents being gathered, was the publication of *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas.* Begun in 1936 under the general supervision of Father Foik, the chronicle has been recently completed by Dr. Carlos E. Castañada of the University of Texas.

With the passing of Father Foik the historical documents which had been collected were threatened with ruin for the want of someone to care for them properly. It was at this moment that Bishop FitzSimon assumed the role of savior. Aside from his studies at the North American College in Rome and at St. Meinrad's Abbey in Indiana, and service in the Navy during World War I, all of his life had been spent in Texas. Hence, both by birth as well as ecclesiastical assignment, the bishop had an innate interest in the journals and letters that had been gathered. On October 22, 1941, he was consecrated Bishop of Amarillo, and it was to his see-city that the historical treasures of Texas Catholicity were transferred.

Though Bishop FitzSimon's training had not been specifically in history, he possessed many of the qualifications mentioned by Monsignor Guilday as required for the formation of a church historian. One of these is his facility with languages, and this attribute was extremely useful in the collection of documents pertinent to the early ecclesiastical history of Texas. Spanish of course had been the official language during the period in which affairs were directed from Madrid or Mexico City. French, however, had been the tongue of most of the pioneer churchmen, and a representative number had been German-speaking. None of these languages nor several others presented any obstacle to Bishop FitzSimon in appraising the worth of documents encountered.

If the bishop has added the avocation of archivist to his episcopal duties, a subsidiary interest in photography has enhanced its success. There is necessarily a limitation to the acquisition of original docu-

ments, regardless of either their utility or the necessity of completing a collection. Extensive employment of microfilming has been the solution, and the archives at Amarillo are notable in the reels of film on hand to supplement original papers. In addition, readily transportable photographic equipment, such as the Contura, is very much a part of Bishop FitzSimon's historical apparatus. A room in the episcopal residence has been equipped with cameras, designed to photograph any sort of written or printed page. There is no problem about development of the pictures, regardless of the equipment used. Trays for developer and fixer, wires and hangers, dryer and all the rest of the apparatus for the dark room are on hand and in proper order for use at any time.

What actually are the historical treasures and possessions in the archives at Amarillo? A complete catalog cannot be given here simply for lack of space. According to a broad general classification, the documents—records, correspondence, journals and diaries—may be said to relate to Catholicity in Texas. That title would be too restrictive, however, relative to the library which has been built up by Bishop FitzSimon. As to the books and periodicals on hand Catholic Americana might be the general category. But, as will be seen later, this designation is by no means comprehensive or inclusive of all the holdings.

Mention should first be made of the material which pertains to the Knights of Columbus in Texas, since this organization sponsored the project in its inception, and continues to give it support. *Proceedings of Texas State Council, Knights of Columbus,* are on hand from 1912 to the present. In several file boxes are the correspondence, resolutions, and other materials relative to the foundation in 1923 of the Texas Knights of Columbus Historical Commission and the operation of that body since that date. Both incoming and copies of outgoing correspondence have been retained, and they are arranged alphabetically and chronologically. In addition, the personal correspondence and the various addresses of the late Father Foik are preserved with other records of the Historical Commission and the twenty-three booklets published under the general heading of *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* in both English and Spanish versions.

Supplementing the archival holdings relating to the Spanish and Mexican rule over Texas are the copies of manuscripts that remain in Mexican archives today. Practically all of this section is in photostats, which have been parceled and placed in file boxes. Since the

labels cannot here be completely included, their titles given below are indicative of the range of material. Here are some of the holdings in the Spanish section:

Archivo General de México, Historia (selected volumes or files);
Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de México, 1685–1807 (Hackett and Dunn Transcripts); also, Audiencia de Guadalajara, 1693–1821;
Archivo de la Iglesia de San Agustín de Laredo, 1789–1881 (baptismal, confirmation, burial records, etc.).
Archivo de la Iglesia de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Paso del Rio del Norte, 1814–1832;
Archivo de la Catedral de San Fernando de San Antonio Texas, 1703–1788;
Archivo de la Secretaria de Gobierno de Estado Coahuila–Saltillo, 1775–1832;
Archivo de Matamoros (not yet arranged chronologically).

Both under the supervision of and with the personal participation of Bishop FitzSimon, microfilms have been made of the records in the various chanceries of the State of Texas. Those from Galveston are of course the most ancient and are completely filmed for the years 1846, the year before this oldest diocese in Texas was erected, to 1888 inclusive. For the Dioceses of Dallas, El Paso, Corpus Christi and San Antonio a selective choice was made, which in each case is extensive.

From the archives of the University of Notre Dame has come matter which either refers to Texas Catholicity or to the personal history of the early Missionaries and pastors from the eastern United States. Among the files which have been microfilmed at the Indiana depository are the Baltimore Papers, Cincinnati Papers, New Orleans Papers, St. Louis Papers, and Vincentian Papers.

As his collection grew the appetite, historically speaking, of Bishop FitzSimon increased. In 1951 he traveled to France and to Italy, and in both countries made arrangements for copying archival items connected with events or personages in the Texas of the past. From the Vincentian archives in Paris were acquired copies or microfilms of material relating to the missionary activities of members of the Congregation of the Mission in Texas during the years 1838 to 1856. Most of this consists of letters from Bishops John M. Odin and John Timon, both Vincentians. Claude M.

Dubuis succeeded Odin as the second Bishop of Galveston when the latter was transferred to the Archbishopric of New Orleans. Bishop FitzSimon was able to make copies of the Dubuis family papers which were in the possession of relatives of the late Bishop of Galveston and had been lent to the Joannin family of Roanne, Loire, France. This valuable acquisition extends from 1846 beyond the death of Bishop Dubuis to 1894.

From the archives of the Congregation of the Propaganda in Rome Bishop FitzSimon secured copies of documents pertaining to Texas for the period from 1838 to 1853. From the depositories of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Lyons, France, and in Fribourg, Switzerland, the bishop had transcriptions made of letters regarding his native state. These cover more than forty years (1845–1888). To make them more readily available the linquist Father Leo F. Lavoie is presently engaged in deciphering the handwriting and typing a transcription. The photographic copies are, notwithstanding, still available for checking and comparison.

The ability of Bishop FitzSimon with a camera was employed in another direction during his European trip of 1951. Literally hundreds of pictures were taken by him in Ambierle and in Coutouvre, both of which are in Loire, France. The first is the birth and burial place on Archbishop Odin, while at the latter Bishop Dubuis is buried, close to where he was born. These historic spots have been photographed from every angle, and the pictures are in albums in the Amarillo archives properly identified.

The protographs on file betoken that the bishop did not restrict himself to places associated with his predecessors in the hierarchy of Texas. Insofar as was possible, pictures were taken also of some place or object associated with the lives of priests being born abroad but becoming missionaries during the past century in the Lone Star State. The visual adjuncts have been made a part of another project of Bishop FitzSimon. Biographies have been compiled of every priest who worked in Texas during the XIX Century. Usually these are condensed accounts, yet the essentials are present. For instance, the bishop persevered until he had secured a copy of the baptismal record of each of these sacerdotal laborers in the vineyard of the Southwest. Adding the photographs, both old and new, has rendered the section on priests one of the best for ready and satisfactory reference in the diocesan depository.

In what might be classed as miscellaneous holdings are many file boxes of clippings and pamphlets. A general classification of

the contents usually has been inscribed on the cover. At a later date these may be integrated with the primary intent of the archives. The same may be ventured for the many boxes of files for individuals or special events. Once the contents of these boxes have been cataloged they may be of high value to some researcher. Under this general heading might also be placed several file boxes which are entitled: Missions des Oblats de Marie Immaculée. An inspection of them revealed that the contents were mostly necrological notices, for the years 1862 to 1932, covering deceased members of this congregation which has been prominent in the Texas missionary field.

Special attention should be called to four legal size scrapbooks, which are labeled: "History of the Diocese of El Paso." These were compiled by Miss Helen Anzer, and rather comprise a chronicle of the episcopacy of the Most Reverend Anthony Simon Schuler, S.J., first Bishop of El Paso. The entries commence in October, 1915, with the election of Bishop Schuler to the West Texas see, and continue to June 10, 1944. The final item is the report of the funeral arrangements for the bishop, who had been living in retirement. While the scrapbooks contain newspaper clippings in the greater part, there are also correspondence, telegrams, and other items of interest.

A large room in Price College, which is administered by the Christian Brothers, is used to house part of the collection of Bishop FitzSimon. Most of the archival material written in Spanish has been quartered in this room. In addition, numerous historical publications are arranged on file shelves in the center of the depository. In the episcopal residence are most of the records in English and French which the Bishop of Amarillo has acquired himself. The photographic department already has been described, and there is still a third historical department in the bishop's house. This is the library, containing a specialized collection that is probably the best in its field. Since all of the books have been acquired by Bishop FitzSimon, unquestionably it represents his choice and discrimination.

"Catholic Americana" represents the nucleus or core of the library, and this division ranges from *Monseigneur Flaget,* par l'Abbé Desgeorge (Paris, 1855) to the recent *Life of James Cardinal Gibbons,* by John Tracy Ellis. As a loyal Texan Bishop FitzSimon has built a very large section referring both directly and obiquely to the Lone Star State. Some of the volumes are current publications, others are book-collectors' items; some are in English, others in Spanish. A bit wider in its coverage of the whole Southwest is the biographical

division, though Texan personages predominate. The former sovereign state, Mexico, is well represented, again with works in both languages. Then, in still another part, are books referring to the West and Southwest, arranged according to the present States of the Union.

Though they could be called "Catholic Americana" only because of the application of some of the contents to the early missionary activity in the United States, three French acquisitions are deserving of separate notice. One, *Annales de l'Association de la Propagation de la Foi,* includes Volume I to LXXX, thus covering the years 1822 to 1910. The other two are in the same field of evangelical work, being *Les Missiones Catholiques* (1869–1890) and *L'Echo de Fourviere* (1863–1895). Turning to Spanish holdings, we find *Biblioteca Histórica Mexicana de Obras Inéditas,* both the first and the second series. Far afield from both, yet still orientated to the general purpose of the library, are those volumes entitled: *Inventory of the County Archives of Texas,* one of the useful productions of the Works Project Administration in the Historical Records Survey.

In a few instances the files of periodical publications are unique in their completeness. Generally, however, the distinction of this library lies in the possesssion of so many which supplement the holdings of archival material and of books. From the titles it is apparent that the quarterlies or annuals are associated with the general themes of "Catholic Americana" and of the history of the State of Texas, especially that bearing on the Church. Besides the history periodicals published by various State historical societies, there are files of some of the sectional, national, and international magazines. Among these are rarer titles, as *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* from the first volume of 1884, *Divulgación Histórica,* and *Texas Almanac* from 1857. Undoubtedly the gaps in bibliographical and geographical periodicals will be filled in time.

The small collection of Catholic newspapers is featured by a complete set of the *Southern Messenger,* whose issues from 1892 to 1902 are on microfilm while those from 1902 are the original copies. For this file a complete index has been compiled. The same has been done for the *Amarillo Register* and *The Texas Catholic,* thus facilitating reference to the contents of the three Catholic papers of the State. Moreover, in the library are dozens of large scrap-books containing newspaper clippings, with the purpose of each collection noted on the cover. Each year a separate scrap-book has been shelved,

containing all available press notices relative to the Knights of Columbus in Texas.

There is a complete card index to this library and, it is of interest to note, on each card there has been added to the usual information the source of the individual acquisition, whether purchased or gift, and the cost or value, with indications that the item is rare or out of print.

In these later years a great number of histories of dioceses, parishes, movements, and events have been written and surely the shelf of biographies of prominent Catholics has grown. Survey histories of the Church in the United States have been published. Yet the question has often been asked: "Can there be a definitive history of the Church written?" To a major extent an affirmative answer depends upon the historical records which are available. When the definitive story is written, the archives of the Diocese of Amarillo will forbid any glossing over of the Church in Texas and much more of the great Southwest. And these records are now accessible for use in the more limited studies which are an essential prelude to the account of the whole Church in this country.

The success which Bishop FitzSimon has realized will undoubtedly inspire others to initiate or intensify efforts in their own localities. For most it is not possible, nor advisable, to attempt a project on as large a scope. Similar efforts on a diocesan, or even a parish level will gladden the hearts of later historians.

PETER J. RAHILL

Mount Providence,
Normandy, Missouri

Book Reviews

A History of The Southern Confederacy. By Clement Eaton. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1954. Pp. ix, 351. $5.50.

Professor Eaton, of the University of Kentucky, has written a clear and compact account of the Southern Confederacy and thus has provided a fitting sequel to his larger work, *A History of the Old South,* not to mention linkage with his earlier *Freedom of Thought in the Old South.* His last book is a welcome addition to a wheelbarrow load of recent titles on the American Civil War and the Lost Cause. It offers an attractive appeal to the general reader without being distasteful or superfluous for the scholar or historian. Its high readability should please even those specialists who may find points of criticism or disagreement on the score of interpretation.

The author holds a balanced perspective in covering a wide range of pictures of the South during four critical years, throwing light on matters of government and politics, military problems, economic stresses and strains, social life, education, literature, and religion. His whole story is sustained and enlivened by a judicious use of sources, both primary and secondary, documentary and personal, printed and hand-written. These sources have been processed or distilled into a fine product that seems a little small at times. Professor Eaton's work can not compare, in military treatment, for example, with Robert S. Henry's larger work, *The Story of the Confederacy,* especially since Henry gives much more emphasis to the campaigns of war. A student of warfare might question a few of Professor Eaton's passing judgments on Confederate generals, who had to act in critical situations without the advantage of hindsight, which is the historian's stock in trade. The Eaton discussion of Confederate foreign activities must not be compared with Professor Frank L. Owsley's *King Cotton Diplomacy.* The excellent chapters on miscellaneous social aspects of Confederate life naturally fall short of Professor E. M. Coulter's six hundred pages in *The Confederate States of America, 1861–1856.* Yet Professor Eaton makes his own contribution to each of the various phases of the South's contest for independence. One might cite his chapter (vii), "The Logistics of the Gray Army" as an analysis of heavy-weight determinism set forth in twenty pages. His last three chapters seem to catch and convey the tragic drama of the decline and fall of the Confederacy. These chapters in order are aptly entitled "Economic Disintegration," "The Loss of the Will to Fight," and "Sunset of the Confederacy." Thus the author eloquently portrays the failure of the South's "Conservative Revolt," to cite the theme of the book and title of the first chapter.

Professor Eaton assumes, and states in the preface of *A History of the Southern Confederacy,* that the Civil War "destroyed a fragile type of society" and "contributed greatly toward creating a glamorous legend . . . of the Old South. . . ." His former writings on the South point to this conclusion. One might question this broad double-barrel assumption, not so much with

a view to rejection but for purposes of modification. The society of the Old South had a fragile feature and lacked much of the glamor which has been attributed to it in legendary form since Appomattox. But there were elements of value and survival, along with serious shortcomings, in that society, as in that of ancient Greece or Rome or Medieval Europe. Otherwise, the South could not have fought its four-year fight, as it did, without any dictatorial fusion in the spirit of a Hitler or a Napoleon. Otherwise, the Old South would not live in a legend of growing proportions with a historical, literary and social impact on mid-twentieth-century America, as is attested by numerous contemporary writings, including the works by Professor Eaton.

At least to this reviewer, Professor Eaton's interesting study of the Confederacy suggests more than it says.

H. C. Nixon

Vanderbilt University

The Jacksonians: A Study in Administrative History, 1829–1861. By Leonard D. White. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1954. Pp. xii, 593. $8.00.

With this volume on *The Jacksonians,* Professor White completes his biography of the administrative system of the government of the United States during the period from 1789 to 1861. Joined to the two earlier parts of the work, *The Federalists* and *The Jeffersonians,* it gives us a unique and highly valuable record of how our national political machinery operated in this formative span of years, exposing to view not only the impressive spectacle of the gigantic instrument in full co-ordinated action, but also the more precise diagrams of the inner works which give motion to the whole.

There will probably be some readers who will wish to criticize Professor White for failing to add to this account any significant attention to the supposed "liberal" and "reactionary" spirits which recent dectrinaires have insisted are to be found at odds during the Jacksonian era. But Professor White is clearly too discriminating to succumb to the temptation to read more into the past than the historical record will support. His concern is with the actual functioning of a political system and with the forces which gave it shape. "Democracy" plays a large part in Dr. White's story, but it is not the "democracy" of the political or economic theorizer which claims his attention. Rather is it the spontaneous demand for power in government which arose from the people as the natural accompaniment of geographic expansion, technological progress, and urban growth. Only the birth of the national political parties could accommodate such a demand or channel its energies, and it is in the effect of the national party on the administrative system that Professor White finds his major theme.

Now for the first time there was to be significant change in the spirit of government from that which had been established by the Federalists and

maintained by the Jeffersonians. Gone was the governing elite, and gone with it was the efficiency and high sense of responsibility and public morality which had been among its admirable traits. In its place was to come the flood of political party adherents, loyal to their cause, hungering for office, and equipped with the suffrage necessary to make their demands heard. In exchange for the virtues of the aristocracy we were to accept the vulgarities and the ineptitudes of the mass, but more than had ever been possible before, the government was to belong to the people.

Even this new force of democracy, however, had little effect on the stability of the constitutional forms. The traditional balance of powers in the government was maintained, though Presidents such as Jackson and Polk tended to a gradual establishment of greater executive strength than had been envisioned perhaps by the Founding Fathers. Moreover, by 1860 the national government was still rather strictly limited in the scope of its operations, and did little more for its citizens than had been done in 1800. It was in the field of local and state government that the greatest political innovations and expansions of public service were to be found.

With this as a general foundation, Professor White proceeds to a minute examination of the operations of every part of the national administration, with a richness of detail which defies condensation in a brief review. It is sufficient, perhaps, to say that historians and political scientists alike will find this volume and its companions indispensable to their understanding of the inner growth of the government of the United States.

Joseph G. Tregle, Jr.

Loyola University of the South

Kino Reports to Headquarters. (Correspondence of Eusebio F. Kino, S.J., from New Spain with Rome.) By Ernest J. Burrus, S.J. Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, Rome, 1954.

Father Kino (1645–1711) was a notable pioneer in the development of Spanish North America. From 1681 to his death in 1711 at Magdalena in Sonora, his adventurous missionary spirit pushed the frontier into Lower California and a broad area along our southwest border. And if he had had his way, and Spanish wars had not checked the flow of royal backing and help, he would have gone far beyond. His stated goal was the extension of his missions so far up the north Pacific coast as to enable Spaniards to live and work along those waters and in their hinterland to the point where they could cross over "towards Japan and Tartary, and as far as Great China . . . , discover a route half the distance (now followed) to Europe, and to the northeast and the east we can get in touch with and carry on commerce with New France." How solidly he built has been told in the memorable biography of Bolton, the *Rim of Christendom.*

There now comes a fine addition to our knowledge of this man, in the fourteen letters embraced in this present work. Printing the original

Spanish text along with its English translation—and several in facsimile, together with the 1683 map of Lower California—the author presents hitherto unpublished correspondence between Kino and his general headquarters in Rome.

The letters fill out the character of the man as he was in real life. Such little touches as appear in his accounts of discovery expeditions, and might escape the notice of an author who merely recounts the movements and the territory, actually throw much light on the person that he was. He knows a good horse. He climbs cliffs with ropes and tells the story as plainly as if he were eating a meal. He thinks nothing of walking thirty-eight miles in a day, and riding many leagues, and on the return he needs no special rest but goes right into the next business at hand. He is much misunderstood, and perhaps a bit of an object of envy to some of his fellows, as one can easily see from his letter of 1689 to his Provincial, Father Soto. The petitions he sent to the King and the General at Rome for permission to carry his outposts to 40°—and he knew his degrees, as his later maps testify—point to a man with vision no less than the success he had already produced.

In the editing some few manual slips occur. Those long Germanic sentences in Spanish words tripped up the translator on two occasions, though without any hurt to the facts. Three or four trifling matters of spelling and punctuation force the reader to back-track along the way. In general, though, this is a true contribution for the student who seeks the main outlines of what Webb has called the "Great Frontier."

W. Eugene Shiels

Xavier University, Cincinnati

Notes and Comments

Professor A. Curtis Wilgus, Director of the School of Inter-American Studies at the University of Florida, has edited the fourth of the publications containing the papers of the participants in the Fourth Annual Caribbean Conference under the title: *The Caribbean: Its Economy, 1953.* The book was available after November, 1954, at The University of Florida Press for four dollars. In it the contributions of twenty authorities on the area have to do with the forces at work in the Caribbean, the resources and production, manufacturing and investments, transportation and marketing, labor and industry, culture and the economy, and the archival patrimony of records in the twelve countries under scrutiny. The papers are stimulating and should be made available to students of Latin American history, since they touch a wider variety of interests than can be adequately treated in classes of history, economics, education, and sociology. Besides, the book should be kept on file as a clear record of conditions at this time and therefore as a basis for studies of the past and of the future. The book is well introduced, well printed, and well edited.

* * * *

The South Atlantic Quarterly for July, 1954, has three interesting papers on international policies and trends. "Britain's Solution of the Problem of Empire," by Carl F. Brand, indicates the development of an empire of Commonwealths. Gale W. McGee has "A China Policy for the United States," which is "to deal with Communist China firmly but not to introduce further aggravations that would sharpen the tensions without opening the way to resolve them." The third paper, "Stalin: Two or Three Echoes," by Joel Carmichael, is an explanation of the workings of Stalin's mind, and of the Soviet cult embracing its operation to the present.

* * * *

Handbook of Latin American Studies: 1951, No. 17, appeared last year, under the general editorship of Francisco Aguilera and the Acting Assistant Editor, Elsie Brown. Prepared by The Hispanic Foundation in the Library of Congress for the purpose of keeping an annual record of books on Latin American studies in social sciences

and humanities, the first thirteen numbers were printed by the Harvard University Press and the last four by the University of Florida Press, Gainesville. Only the last nine numbers are available, 9–13 from the former Press and 14–17 from the latter. The price of the present volume is eight and a half dollars. If there is one set on Latin America that every library must have and every professor in the field should have, it is this series. The editing, the bibliographical essays heading each section, the comments and calendaring of each of the 3198 entries, the references to periodicals which reviewed them, the indexing and cross-indexing are worthy of admiration. Gratitude from all concerned is due to the host of competent editors for a painstaking and useful task.

* * * *

As an offshoot of his studies on Pierre Jean De Smet, Father William L. Davis of Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington, has published and is distributing *A History of St. Ignatius Mission.* The book is paper bound and indexed in 147 pages and modestly priced at two dollars. Father Davis has his own way of telling the story of the old Jesuit mission in the beautiful valley beside the Mission Range of the Rockies in Montana. A bibliography chiefly of sources is given first with an abbreviation for each item; the citations in the text do not become footnotes but the abbreviated references are bracketed after the quotations. There are five appendices, the first of which is a group of biographical sketches of people prominent in the opening and development of the Flathead mission. The style is simple, even abbreviated, and authorities are constantly cited in full.

* * * *

Philosophical Library, Publishers, is very rapidly filling the shelves of its Midcentury Reference Library, the general heading for a long list of dictionaries and encyclopedias under the general direction of Dagobert D. Runes. Nearly forty of such books are now available while forty more are in project. However, the list of projected works is regularly augmented by one or other book not indicated as being in progress. Among the very recent publications several may be noted.

Dictionary of Linguistics, by Mario A. Pei and Frank Gaynor, is designed to be a ready reference book for students of grammar, philology, historical and structural linguistics, phonetics and pho-

nemics. The compilation of words includes the general run of traditional grammatical terms, the more frequently used terms of historical linguistics since 1800, the modern descriptive terms about whose meaning there is agreement, and the names and affiliations of the major languages and dialects of the world today. This book called for much research in many languages. For example we choose at random the word Gobbledegook. This is defined as "A term coined by Maury Maverick for the complicated, overinvolved, and often incomprehensible jargon of government bureaucracy; later extended to cover also such professional jargons as the *Medicalese* of the physicians and the *Pedageese* of the educators. Known also as *Bafflegab, Officialese, Federalese.*"

Dictionary of Last Words, is compiled by Edward S. LeComte and published this January. The compiler here had the problem of finding out who emitted last words and who did not, then of choosing more important people for quotations, then of verifying the saying or the writing. The author has an interesting introduction, which includes his sources and method of selection. This will be a handy book.

The Art of Primitive Peoples, by J. T. Hooper and C. A. Burland, recommends itself by reason of the fine format and more than a hundred pictures of specimens of primitive art collected around the world by Mr. Hooper. The first part is a series of essays in chapter form which reveal the broad bases and motivations of art common to peoples everywhere and the specific forms of expression distinguishing Pacific Islanders, Africans and Americans. The second part of the book contains descriptions and pictures of the primitive carvings, masks, and figures.

The most pretentious of these recent publications is *Treasury of Philosophy,* edited by Dagobert D. Runes. While the prices of the three books noted above are respectively six, five, and seven and a half dollars this last tome of some twelve hundred pages is ten for the pre-publication copy and fifteen dollars for the de luxe edition. With three hundred eighty philosophers from 600 B. C. to the present it has the advantage over other compilations as to numbers of entries and recent inclusions. A brief biography of each philosopher precedes a selection representative of his writings. In this the aim has been to indicate the import and influence of the philosopher. Of course, there will be some quibbling about the selections of the men and the passages from their works. This is to be expected. A most

notable omission is the name of Thomas À Kempis, whose *Imitation of Christ* has been more read than any writing except the Bible for almost six centuries.

Along with this large output of compilations Philosophical Library has continued publishing monographs. *Scourge of the Swastika,* A short History of Nazi War Crimes, by Lord Russell of Liverpool, describes not the Nuremberg and lesser known trials of war criminals, but the methods, instruments, agencies and men engaged in sadistic persecutions of Germans and other peoples and especially in committing "the greatest crime in world history," the murder of over five million European Jews. Here are two hundred sixty pages and photographs which one cannot view avidly nor long. The author was forced to resign the office of Judge Advocate General of the Forces in London "because of his refusal to drop publication of this book."

* * * *

There is "A Survey of Publications in Ohio History, Archaeology and Natural History, August 1953–July 1954" in the October, 1954, *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly.* This is a very good bibliographical list compiled by S. Winifred Smith, and it covers practically everything written on Ohio and Ohioans for the specified year. In this same number there is also a documentary article of interest by George Ruppel, S.M., "Early Days of the University of Dayton: Excerpts from the Chronicles of Nazareth." These Chronicles are a manuscript history of the first thirty years of Dayton University by Brother John A. Brueck.

* * * *

An interesting discussion on the question "What is an Indian?" appeared in the November, 1954, *Pacific Historical Review.* It is in the article "Race and Class in Mexico," by Woodrow Borah, who sought out the various meanings of the word to writers and officials and in various places and at various times. His conclusion is that in Mexico the term Indian has no racial significance but is generally used to indicate a peasant.

* * * *

"How much of what we now cherish as the American tradition was shaped in the 175 years before the winning of independence?" This is the question Professor Clinton Rossiter of Cornell answers

in his "The Shaping of the American Tradition" appearing in the October, 1954, *William and Mary Quarterly.* Separation of Church and State ideas were well grounded by 1800. The economic tradition of the capitalistic system in general with its specific principles of free trade and enterprise, management and labor, government intervention and controls, dates back to the colonies. In the social tradition there are many contradictions and disputes, especially as to origins of individualism. On the political side Rossiter thinks that "democracy as we know it had no real standing in Colonial America." It began to sprout in the Revolution and thereafter. The moral, legal and other ideals are not treated in detail.

* * * *

Everyone seems to have his own definition of academic freedom and periodically someone breaks into print on the subject. Victor S. Bryant presents his discussion in the October, 1954, *South Atlantic Quarterly.* According to Bryant, a professor should be allowed in the classroom freedom to teach what his studies and research have taught him. Outside the classroom he should be free to give his opinions on anything, but should not associate his opinions with those of the university nor leave auditors under the impression that what he says is the official position.

* * * *

"American Photography, 1845–1865," takes up very much of the space in *Chicago History,* Fall, 1954, and does so attractively. Paul M. Angle, Editor of the magazine and Director of the Chicago Historical Society which publishes it, has chosen a number of fine daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, and photographs with one *carte de visite* and stereograph of the period to illustrate his instructive article.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 37, NUMBER 2 APRIL 1955

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

APRIL 1955

VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

BRITAIN AND DIRECT SPANISH AMERICAN TRADE, 1815–1925 . . . *Bernadine Pietraszek* 67

THE FRONTIER ARMY OFFICER, 1794–1814 . . . . . *Norman W. Caldwell* 101

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS
RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, $2.00; in foreign countries, $2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA
An Historical Review
APRIL 1955
VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 2

Britain and Direct Spanish American Trade, 1815-1925

The question of British trade, direct to and from Spanish America, was of vital significance both in the post-Napoleonic European politics and in the emancipation and recognition of the Spanish colonies. Yet this point has either received little direct attention or else been lost in the maze of broader topics. British demands for direct trade with the Spanish colonies, Spanish response and counter-proposals, and the development of British policy to conform to the ever-changing status of national interests and the revolutionary South American colonies form the basis of this study. The stake was high. Previous fruitless efforts to secure liberalization of Spanish monopolistic commercial regulations only tended to spur the British on to press their demands more vigorously. Thus the stage was set for an era of great decisions.

Before the guns of the Napoleonic wars were stilled forever, British and Spanish diplomats began anew to resolve the question of South American trade. Ths policy of Castlereagh, as early as 1812, was to effect a reconciliation between Spain and the restless, revolting South American colonies but only on certain conditions—giving the South Americans the full rights of Spanish subjects and, significantly, free commercial intercourse with all nations. In relation to the latter condition, Spain, as the parent state, was to enjoy commercial preference.[1] British interests in this matter were not entirely unselfish. Urged on by the pressing demands of the mercantile class, the British diplomats sought commercial concessions from the Spanish Government but with no tangible success.

[1] A. W. Ward and G. P. Gooch, eds., *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy* 1783–1919, New York, 1923, II, 14.

On January 26, 1815, Henry Wellesley, the British Ambassador to Spain, reported to Lord Castlereagh upon the state of negotiations between the two nations. He said British relations with Spain respecting South American commerce were in a very unpleasant condition. Moreover, due to poor communication between the various Spanish departments, it was difficult to obtain answer to any representations.[2] Relations between the two governments grew more strained when the Spanish Government announced its intention to send an expedition to South America to suppress all trade with foreign nations. In a letter dated February 28, 1815, Viscount Strangford was instructed to adopt the most effectual means of warning British subjects trading in the Rio Plata, without a license from the Spanish Government, to remove their ships and effects lest they suffer the consequences of the proposed blockade.[3] At this particular time the British Government did not manifest any staunch determination to protect commercial interests in the South American colonies.

British neutrality in the contest between Spain and her colonies was suggested by one group in Parliament. Certain members believed the British had violated this neutrality with the final result that the South American patriots complained and the Spaniards accused Britain of aiding in the destruction of the Spanish constitutional government.[4] In his speech, the Chancellor of the Exchequer emphasized the necessity of remaining neutral, although great commercial advantages would accrue to British mercantile interests if the colonies gained their freedom.[5]

The strict observance of neutrality was by no means the most predominant thought in the House of Commons. Mr. Whitbread stated that New Spain was treated unjustly by the mother country and he believed it was to the best interest of Great Britain to cultivate the friendship of the colonials.[6] Further example of official and mercantile interests, ignoring the protests of Spain, can be found in the discussions of the House of Commons, March 13, 1815, over the South Sea Company.[7]

---

[2] Charles Vane, Marquess of Londonderry, ed., *Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh*, London, X, 246.

[3] C. K. Webster, ed., *Britain and the Independence of Latin America* 1812–1830, London, 1938, I, 95–96.

[4] *The Parliamentary Debates*, Published under the Superintendence of T. C. Hansard, London, XXX, 159–160, March 13, 1815.

[5] *Ibid.*, 160.

[6] *Ibid.*, 161.

[7] *Ibid.*, 157–158.

The Spanish Government, however, displayed a willingness to discuss possible trade concessions to the British in return for mediating the dispute with her insurgent colonials. What was British reaction to the proposed mediation? On May 26, 1815, Wellesley wrote to D. Pedro Cevallos, Spanish Minister of State, and explained that the British king decided not to undertake any mediation until he was clearly informed of the principles upon which the Spanish Government proposed to enter into the negotiation.[8]

The Spanish position in the matter of mediation was partially divulged in a letter from Charles R. Vaughan to Castlereagh, November 16, 1815. Vaughn referred to a discussion with Cevallos concerning the desire of the Spainsh Government to avail itself of British mediation for which Spain would concede to Britain a participation in South American trade. This concession, however, depended upon the successful completion of reuniting the colonies to Spain by any means within British power. Cevallos stressed it was absolutely necessary that any such concession had to be a reward for some special service in order to prevent other nations from demanding similar privileges.[9]

At one point in the discussion between Vaughan and Cevallos, the Spaniard suggested the British send ships, men, or even a loan of money to suppress the fire of revolution in South America. Vaughan refused to transmit such a proposal to England. He further told Castlereagh that Cevallos doubted the possibility of securing a written document stating the precise terms of the proposal, due to the intrigue which would develop. When informed that little weight could be attached to a conversation without an explicit proposal, Cevallos insisted the Spanish King authorized him to state that the trade of America would be opened to Britain as the price for successful mediation.[10] The reference to a written agreement stating the grant of commercial concessions in return for mediation is most significant. During the entire 1815 to 1825 period, the British constantly reminded the Spanish that these concessions had been granted, but they could not produce documentary proof. Apparently, the Spanish Government never conceded, in written form, the right of direct trade with the Spanish colonies. Why was the Spanish Government reluctant to do so?

In still another section of the November 16 letter, Vaughan

---

8 Pedro Torres Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, Madrid, 1912, IV, 102–103.

9 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 341.

10 *Ibid.*, 342.

mentioned having told Cevallos that the mutual interests of the two nations would be best served by a commercial concession for Britain to trade with the Spanish colonies upon just and equitable terms. Vaughan remarked that the present state of the Spanish Government made the problem of mediation even more difficult than before Ferdinand's return. He feared that if the deliberations regarding concessions were made in the Catholic King's councils there would be a great delay in British interference. Cevallos attempted to explain the want of sincerity on the part of Spain in these negotiations as being due to the prejudices held by the Spaniards about opening the colonial trade to the British.[11]

The letter discussed above also referred to a July 13, 1815, report of the Council of Indies to the King of Spain. The Council recommended to Ferdinand VII

> to preside in the Council of his Ministers and to call upon them to examine the state of the relations between Spain and Great Britain, and to lose no time in conciliating the interests of the latter by an adjustment of all differences and a fair treaty of commerce, as, unless the trade to Spanish America is opened to Great Britain, the Colonies cannot be preserved to Spain; that every effort should be made to obtain the powerful influence of England for a reconciliation of the Colonies, which Spain cannot hope to bring about by her own means. . . .[12]

The above reportedly was signed by the whole Council and presented to the Spanish king. Vaughan used both this report and the conferences held with Cevallos to instruct Castlereagh that a material change in the disposition of the Spanish Government had taken place since the question of mediation was last discussed. The opening of trade was no longer entirely repugnant to the Spaniards who sensed the futility of suppressing the rebellious colonies by their own force. Vaughan advised that the offer of mediation be brought, without delay, before the British Government lest other foreign powers step in.[13]

On December 20, 1815, Castlereagh sent his answer to Vaughan's letter. He claimed it was difficult to get any official decision upon the Spanish proposals. One of the reasons advanced was that Britain would have to be certain Spain would pursue a liberal policy toward the South American colonies as one basis of her future supremacy over them. Castlereagh's letter disclaimed any desire for exclusive commercial advantages as this would destroy British influence.

---

11 *Ibid.*, 342–343.
12 *Ibid.*, 344.
13 *Ibid.*, 344–345.

Furthermore, he added the British monarch himself always recommended that the commerce of South America be opened to all nations with moderate duties and with preferential treatment accorded to Spain herself.[14]

It is difficult to measure immediate Spanish reaction to British views, especially those expressed by Castlereagh. The conclusions of the Spanish Council of State during 1815 gave some indications as to how far the Spanish were willing to go in granting commercial concessions to Britain. First, in return for English mediation commercial privileges ought to be yielded. Secondly, it was necessary for the British to unite with Spain for the purpose of subjecting the rebellious colonies. If the mediation could not be effected by a specified period of time, the British should cut off commercial activities with the colonies. Moreover, any commerce with the insurgent Spanish colonies during the mediation period had to be carried on in designated ports.[15]

Abstinence from trade was farthest from the minds of many commercially-minded Britishers. One of the most anxious of these was Brougham, who in a speech on agricultural distress, April 9, 1816, advanced some important reasons for not relinquishing South American trade. Brougham believed that British connections with Spain might result in some arrangements to facilitate British commerce with the rich markets of Mexico, Brazil and Peru. He realized that presently a considerable trade was carried on with those areas but under trammels which rendered it precarious and most isksome. Since no British commercial or political consuls resided in these regions, the existing commerce took on the appearance of contraband trade. Even under these conditions, Brougham admitted, the trade was very beneficial to British mercantile interests and would prove doubly so if it became regular and authorized.[16]

In the meantime, negotiations with Spain remained unsuccessful. On May 9, 1816, Henry Wellesley wrote to the effect that only by working upon Spanish fears would it be possible to secure advantages. He thought Spain ungrateful since past British influence was exerted to promote objects of greater importance to Spain than to Britain. If the present situation was such that Spain was unable to maintain her control over the South American colonies, it was due to her own

---

14 *Ibid.*, 346.

15 Jerónimo Becker, *Historia de las Relaciones Exteriores de España Durante el siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1924, I, 488–489.

16 *Speeches of Henry Brougham*, Edinburgh, 1838, I, 544–545.

deplorable system and her lack of confidence in the only power which invariably supported her interests.[17]

Wellesley's notation of May 29, 1816, evidenced further disharmony between the Spanish and British Governments. In a conversation with M. Pizarro, the Spanish Minister of State, Wellesley stated that the actions of the Spanish Minister of Finance in regard to British trade almost justified a declaration of war. In the least, it proved a serious impediment to amicable relations between Britain and Spain.[18] What the Minister of Finance was guilty of could not be ascertained. Judging by Wellesley's comment, its nature was serious.

While the British complained of Spanish reticence to grant direct trade, the Spaniards continued to urge mediation with trade as the reward. On July 5, 1816, the Spanish Ambassador in London, Count Fernan Núñez, wrote to Pedro Cevallos enclosing a letter from General Roche which outlined a plan for pacifying the Americas. He hoped Britain might accept this proposal.[19]

On October 17, 1816, Fernan Núñez wrote to Castlereagh regarding their conference of September 15, 1816. In this conference, Castlereagh intimated that Spain could no longer ensure the tranquil possession of her South American colonies without pardoning the rebels and opening colonial commerce to foreign trade. The exclusive commercial system adhered to so rigidly by Spain was both harmful to the colonials and opposed to the liberal views prevailing in Europe, Castlereagh told the Spanish representative. Fernan Núñez replied that exclusive commerce was advocated by Spanish mercantile interests which enriched themselves through it. This group apparently exercised great influence upon the Spanish monarchy. At the same time, the populace allowed itself to be misled about the advantages which accrued from exclusive trade. It was necessary, therefore, to proceed cautiously in reforming the present system, Fernan Núñez insisted. He also stated the Spanish Government had contemplated for some time the calculated risk of opposing the entrenched mercantile class.[20] Furthermore, Fernan Núñez claimed that the Spanish king was at a loss to comprehend the utility the British expected to derive from the open trade. British cooperation against the insurgents was a duty. The warfare, in turn,

---

17 F. A. Wellesley, *The Diary and Correspondence of Henry Wellesley,* First Lord Cowley 1790–1846, London, 85.

18 *Ibid.*, 86.

19 Lanzas, *Independencia de America,* IV, 198.

20 Webster, *Britain and Independence,* II, 347–348.

ravaged the South American colonies to the point where they no longer provided rich markets. Civil war also ruined the mines and decreased a much-needed metal which Britain used in her eastern commerce.[21]

Spanish governmental disputation centering around direct trade must be considered. On October 22, 1816, the President of the Council of Indies, Duke de Montemar, wrote to Cevallos about the pacification of American colonies and the existing system of commerce.[22] The very same day, Montemar again wrote to Cevallos in compliance with a secret royal order of September 7, 1816, upon the methods of pacifying South America as proposed by D. Miguel de Lastarría. The ideas of the Councillor D. Francisco Aranga relative to commerce were also explained.[23] The proposals of Lastarría and Arango were discussed in a most confidential note to Cevallos together with José Pablo Valiente's suggestions regarding commerce.[24] On October 24, 1816, Miguel de la Bodega mentioned the pacification of South America and British mediation to achieve this purpose.[25]

In a private and confidential letter dated December 20, 1816, Castlereagh wrote to Wellesley about a reply to Fernán Núñez concerning commercial privileges in return for mediation. He turned down the Spanish suggestion of using British arms and added:

> In 1812, they offered us exclusive commercial advantages if we would mediate. We declined exclusive advantages, but declared our willingness to mediate upon terms liberal between Spain and South America, including a commercial system somewhat similar to our own in the East Indies, which would leave to Old Spain a reasonable preference and give their American subjects the benefit of a qualified intercourse with other nations, in which we did not aim at more than our fair participation, declining however to make our Mediation an armed one. The Spanish Government of that day never absolutely rejected our terms, but never being in terms accepted, the Mediation fell to the ground. Whenever the subject has been since mentioned, which has been the case more than once in the shape of a new invitation to us to interfere, we have always desired, before we gave an answer, to know whether they admitted the basis on which we offered to mediate (so far as it was applicable to the existing state of things), or what basis they had to propose.[26]

The above excerpt bears further evidence that the Spanish had not presented the British with a written agreement granting direct

---

21 *Ibid.*, 348.
22 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 226–227.
23 *Ibid.*, 227.
24 *Ibid.*, 226.
25 *Ibid.*, 227–228.
26 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 350–351.

trade to the South American colonies prior to 1815 nor were the British willing to use force to subject the colonies to Spanish domination.

Madrid answered British protestations with further requests for mediation. The Spanish Government still entertained the idea of granting direct trade as a reward for British services in this issue.[27] On January 10, 1817, the Spanish Secretary of State, José Garcia de León y Pizarro, wrote to Wellesley proposing mediation.[28] On February 8, 1817, British proposals were considered by the Council of Indies, and Montemar expressed his viewpoint regarding freedom of commerce.[29]

In the meantime, the Spanish Government became more apprehensive mainly due to British activities in South America. On May 27, 1817, Luis de Onís wrote to Pizarro about a plan formulated by the British for monopolizing Spanish American commerce—all under the cloak of pacification.[30] At this point, some doubt arose over the wisdom of employing the British as mediators. An anonymous report of a Spanish Councillor of State in part reflected this opinion. Dated July 1817, the report asked several questions: whether one principal means of maintaining Spanish domination over the colonies, once the revolutionary fires were extinguished, was freedom of commerce, and, if it was necessary to procure British mediation to subject the rebellious colonies.[31]

Spanish anxieties were not lessened by further British pressure for direct trade and the refusal to use arms to effect successful Spanish authority over the colonies. A Foreign Office memorandum, August 20, 1817, stressed the above two points. The confidential memorandum reiterated that Britain did not wish exclusive privileges in Spanish American ports.[32] A further memorandum dated August 28, 1817, ruled out the use of armed force in behalf of the Spanish Government.[33] More alarming was the representation from the Royal Company of the Philippines to Pizarro, September 20, 1817. Enclosed was a translation of an article inserted in the London *Courier* of September 5, 1817. The article contained an extract of a petition from the merchants in Jamaica to the British Government

---

[27] Lanzas, *Independencia de America,* IV, 225–226, Report of the Council of Indies, 1816.
[28] *Ibid.,* 245.
[29] *Ibid.,* 251.
[30] *Ibid.,* 266.
[31] *Ibid.,* 284.
[32] Webster, *Britain and Independence,* II, 355–357.
[33] *Cambridge History,* II, 64–65.

for protecting the commerce which grew with South America.[34] On September 30, 1817, the Spanish Ambassador in London, Duke de San Carlos, wrote to Pizarro that illicit British assistance to the South American rebels had to be stopped since it presented an obstacle to successful conclusion of the mediation by European powers.[35]

Spanish attempts to secure European intervention in subduing the insurgent colonies irked British feelings, especially those of the Duke of Wellington. In a letter to Wellesley, October 26, 1817, Wellington referred to a note written by Fernán Núñez which the Spaniard intended to circulate to all but the British Ambassador. Wellington saw the note in confidence and referred to it as an absurd paper likely to prevent the British Government from entering into the mediation. If he were the British Minister, Wellington said, he would decline to interfere in any way in the scheme of pacification. Furthermore, Wellington pointed out numerous representations. First of all, the Spaniards claimed Britain offered mediation unsolicited to which Wellington countered by saying it was forced upon Britain by Spanish intrigues at the conference in Paris. Secondly, the Spanish accused British officers of assisting South American insurgents. Thirdly, the Núñez paper objected to opening colonial trade. It was Wellington's opinion that despite the kindness accorded to Núñez in Britain, he was still the most determined enemy the country had—at least as far as was in his power to be.[36] Perhaps Spanish accusations of illicit aid to the colonials resulted in the passage of a proclamation on November 27, 1817, prohibiting British subjects from taking part in the contest between Spain and her colonies.[37]

On December 10, 1817, San Carlos wrote to Castlereagh and stressed the point that all European commercial interests suffered if these insurgent colonies were not restored to the legitimate monarch.[38] Eighteen days later, Henry Wellesley complained to the Spanish Minister of State about the intended blockade which would extend to the ports of Chili, Peru, the Orinoco, Guayra and the island of Margarita and was designed to curb the revolts. He

---

[34] Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 298.
[35] *Ibid.*, 303–304.
[36] Duke of Wellington, ed., *Supplementary Despatches, Correspondence and Memoranda of Field Marshall Arthur Duke of Wellington*, London, XII, 115–116.
[37] *British and Foreign State Papers*, compiled by the Librarian and Keeper of the Papers, Foreign Office, London, 1830, 1816–1817, 488.
[38] Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 361.

stated its legality depended upon the effectiveness of the blockade.[39] According to various contemporary opinions, Spanish blockades were ineffective and, therefore, illegal. Such a concept certainly worked to British advantage.

Despite marked disagreement between Spain, negotiations continued at a fairly normal pace. On both March 4, and March 5, 1818, San Carlos wrote to Pizarro and discussed British views regarding the mediation.[40] On March 23, 1818, San Carlos was instructed to discuss cleverly the question of mercantile concessions in return for mediation.[41] The next day, the British Government replied to San Carlos.[42] On official letter to San Carlos, April 6, 1818, advised him to inform Castlereagh of the prevailing Spanish disposition in regard to commercial privileges providing Spain obtained definite encouragement on the subject of mediation.[43] On April 21, 1818, San Carlos reported to Pizarro the results of a conference with Castlereagh.[44]

The uncertain state of commerce in South America elicited much concern in Spain. Knowledge of British trade only aggravated an already unpleasant situation. On May 4, 1818, the Secretary of Finance, D. Rafael Morant, made some observations upon the possibility of free commerce with the Americas in which he included a financial statement of the deplorable state of that commerce.[45]

British commercial activities added to the disquieting Spanish-South American relations. An act passed by Parliament, May 23, 1818, contributed towards the further disruption of peaceful mother country-colony commercial arrangements. Part of the act stated:

> that it shall and may be lawful to import Tobacco, Rice, Grain, Peas, Beans, and Flour, into any of His Majesty's Colonies or Plantations in the West Indies, or on the Continent of South America, for the supply of the Inhabitants thereof in British-built Ships owned, registered, and navigated according to Law, from any Colony or Possession in the West Indies, or on the Continent of America, under the dominion of any Foreign *European* Sovereign or State.[46]

While the above referred solely to importation of certain commodities, British trade to South America embraced exportation of numer-

39 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 335.
40 *Ibid.*, 358.
41 *Ibid.*, 366–367.
42 *Ibid.*, 367.
43 *Ibid.*, 370–371.
44 *Ibid.*, 373–374.
45 *Ibid.*, 377.
46 *British State Papers*, 1817–1818, 735.

ous British goods to these colonies to the utter distress of Spain. At times, the flow of British products to South America was quite large and resulted in glutted markets.[47]

British commercial involvement in South America did not terminate Spanish negotiations. On June 2, 1818, San Carlos wrote to Pizarro regarding a conference with Castlereagh and Wellington for further negotiations on the subject of pacifying the South American colonies.[48] This very same day, San Carlos wrote another letter to Pizarro and informed him of ultimate British intentions regarding mediation and the demonstrated indifference of the British Government.[49]

On June 13, 1818, San Carlos gave Pizarro an account of the proximate number of expeditions which sailed from English ports in favor of the American insurgents.[50] Similar letters found their way to the Spanish Government during the entire 1815 to 1825 period.

By the middle of 1818, the Spanish Government decided once more to lay its colonial problem before the allied European powers. The following points were agreed upon as the core of the proposed discussion. The first granted amnesty to the insurgents at the time of submission. The second equal consideration to the native Americans with respect to employment and honors. The third provided for an arrangement of colonial mercantile relations with foreign powers upon principles in keeping with the new political situation of those colonies and of Europe. Lastly, the Spanish king proposed to adopt measures suggested by his allies which were compatible with his dignity and rights.[51] The reaction to this proposal could not be evaluated.

The Council of Indies on August 22, 1818, deliberated the wisdom of opening the commerce of the Isthmus of Panama to friends and neutrals.[52] Ten days later, San Carlos wrote to Pizarro about two conferences with Castlereagh regarding the oft-discussed subject of mediation. At these meetings, Castlereagh informed San Carlos that if the rebellious provinces insisted upon their independence, the British under no circumstances or pretext would employ arms to persuade them to accept Spanish domination.[53] Since the

47 Jean Baptiste Say, "Letters to Mr. Malthus on various subjects of Political Economy particularly on the causes of the general stagnation of commerce," translated for *The Pamphlateer*, XVIII, London, 1821, 295.
48 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 382.
49 *Ibid.*, 382–383.
50 *Ibid.*, 385.
51 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 369, June 18, 1818.
52 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 401.
53 *Ibid.*, 406.

Spanish thought along the lines of forced submission, they probably were unwilling to concede commercial advantages under any other proposal. Perhaps they realized the present state of the colonies was such that only armed force could bring about submission.

In the November 9, 1818, letter to Castlereagh, the Earl of Liverpool criticized the attitude of the new Spanish minister. According to Liverpool's letter, this minister proposed that the commerce of Britain, along with that of other foreign powers, be carried on only through Spanish ports. This, of course, revived the colonial monopoly system so repugnant to British mercantile interests. Liverpool then differentiated between the trade going to the colonies presently independent from the mother country, which Spain was hardly able to reconquer, and those in which the Spanish still exercised some control. Mediation would probably be beneficial only in the case of the latter.[54]

The Spanish still thought in terms of mediation as late as the end of 1818. On November 15, 1818, Morant referred to the consultation of the Council of Indies of August 22, 1818, relative to the state of foreign commerce in Panama. He mentioned that one of the principle points treated in discussions concerning the pacification of the Americas was that of free commerce for foreign nations.[55] In spite of Spain's willingness to grant concessions, Castlereagh was doubtful whether the Spanish Government would accept mediation. Castlereagh, in a letter to Liverpool, November 26, 1818, suggested that Wellington should be sent to Madrid to negotiate with the Spaniards.[56] Wellesley's report to Castlereagh, December 21, 1818, evidenced the unfriendly spirit towards the British Ambassador and his proposals mentioned in various other reports. Constant British demands for free commerce with Spanish colonies coupled with the manner in which these were presented proved embarrassing to Wellesley.[57]

On January 5, 1819, the Council of Cádiz inquired of the Spanish Secretary of State whether the Spanish king had prepared any measures dealing with South American commerce which were pending deliberation in the Council of State.[58] British interests experienced a revitalization at this time. The persistent manner in which they pressed their demands for free trade caused the other foreign Euro-

54 Wellington, *Supplementary Despatches*, XII, 823.
55 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 416–417.
56 Castlereagh, *Memoirs*, XII, 90–91.
57 *Ibid.*, 94–95.
58 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, IV, 424–425.

pean powers to look suspiciously in their direction. One of the powers deeply concerned in the Anglo-Spanish controversy was Russia.[59]

British insistence that neutrality was maintained failed to convince the European powers and especially the watchful Spaniard. To prevent further foreign intervention in behalf of the insurgents, the Spanish king issued a declaration on January 14, 1819. This declaration provided means for punishing foreigners who traded with the colonials over Spanish protests. Castlereagh spoke with San Carlos relative to the above declaration and explained British sentiments on the issue. He agreed with the main principle and commented that Britain would not feel impelled to interpose in behalf of its subjects who aided the insurgents either in a civil or military capacity.[60] However, as Castlereagh's letter to Henry Wellesley, March 12, 1819, clearly stated, there were certain conditions under which the British would not tolerate maritime interference. In the first case, British citizens engaged in purely commercial activity in South America could not be subject to the Spanish proclamation. The second case to which the British took exception dealt with British ships carrying arms and munitions to the rebellious provinces. While Castlereagh admitted Spanish jurisdiction in capturing and condemning vessels which transgressed the rules of neutrality, and the orders of their own government, he could not acquiesce in the infliction of personal severity upon the crew of these vessels. Castlereagh insisted this distinction applied to all vessels under the British flag whether found on the high seas or "accidentally" within any of the South American ports. Wellesley was told to inform M. Casa Irujo of these principles so that instructions might be given to Spanish authorities abroad as a precautionary measure against any possible misunderstanding.[61]

Further evidence showing the state of the British mind on this subject can be found in George Canning's May 18, 1819, speech in Parliament. Characterized by obvious pro-South American sympathies, the speech emphasized British neutrality and willingness to mediate—on its own terms. Canning condemned the contraband munitions trade with insurgents and stressed amicable relations with the Spanish colonies as the wisest course. Competition in an open market, not exclusive trade privileges was the British goal.[62] One

59 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 376–377.
60 *Ibid.*, 379–380.
61 *Ibid.*, 380.
62 R. Therry, ed., *The Speeches of the Right Honourable George Canning*, London, 1828, IV, 127–129, *passim.*

of the significant points of the above speech was the admission of the illegality of a trade in arms and munitions. No stigma was placed upon other commercial activities.

However strong the pro-South American sympathies might be, the British Government realized something should be done about the number of British citizens taking military part in the rebel cause. Spain's complaints could not go unheeded. The result was the proposal of a Foreign Enlistment Bill which precipitated much discussion in Parliament and midst mercantile groups. On June 3, 1819, the Bill was debated with great stress upon the British commercial interests in the Americas. Sir Robert Wilson spoke in behalf of the merchants, manufacturers and shipowners of London who objected to the Bill. Subscribed by 1,700 London "people of trade," the petition of this group looked at the proposed measure as grievously injurious to British mercantile interests.[63] The speeches of Messrs. Denman and Douglas echoed similar fears.[64] However, Canning favored the Bill saying that lawless bands of armed men raised for foreign service did not serve the interest of Great Britain nor safeguard her South American trade.[65] In the debate on June 21, 1819, Robert Grant spoke for the passage of the Bill on the basis that British commercial interests should not interfere with justice.[66] Lord Nugent argued against the Bill and challenged Spain's word to institute a more liberal commercial policy.[67] However, the Bill was passed. Discussion in the House of Lords found its members divided pro and con. In the June 28, 1819, debates, the Earl of Westmorland sanctioned the Bill as a stimulant to British trade.[68] The Marquess of Lansdowne was of another opinion. He believed no obstacle should be placed in the way of South American trade.[69]

The Foreign Enlistment Bill having been sanctioned by Parliament, attention was focused upon more pressing matters. On September 24, 1819, Castlereagh wrote a letter to Lord Stewart in which he looked with disdain upon Spanish efforts to repossess the revolted colonies by means of an expedition. If the Spaniards proved successful, Castlereagh added, it meant the re-establishment of an ancient monopolistic colonial system. Even though mediation failed

63 *Parliamentary Debates*, XL, 859–860.
64 *Ibid.*, 880–889.
65 *Ibid.*, 1108–1110.
66 *Ibid.*, 1254.
67 *Ibid.*, 1259.
68 *Ibid.*, 1398.
69 *Ibid.*, 1405.

to become a reality, he still hoped Spain might base future colonial policy upon the liberal terms suggested by her allies.

> In a commercial sense this Government feels less solicitude upon this question than is generally supposed; in some way or other, the wants of South America will be supplied; that supply must come from Europe, and this country will in some mode or other furnish its full share of this supply; but they look with regret and alarm to the decision, and especially for the best interests of Spain herself, not merely as forcing commerce into pernicious channels of a contraband intercourse to the great prejudice of her true financial policy, but as laying the seeds of future discontent and successive insurrections throughout South America.[70]

There is a note of defiance in Castlereagh's letter. Apparently, British mercantile thought had developed to the extent that direct trade with the Spanish colonies would be carried on contrary to Spanish wishes. What is even more interesting is that such a high official as Castlereagh should express himself in this fashion. As time progressed, the British not only decided to trade despite Spanish protests but also "logically" proved the legality of their conduct. The growth of this concept is evident in various portions in this study.

The Spanish Government was well aware of British sentiments and such knowledge tended to create disharmony in the negotiations between the two countries. On June 6, 1820, Wellesley reported to Castlereagh that the Duke of San Fernando complained about the frequency of his discussions upon commercial topics. Otherwise, Wellesley said, San Fernando was desirous of doing everything within his power to conciliate relationships.[71] Wellesley's comparative success in dealing with the Spaniards at this time was not indicative of previous misunderstanding. For example, on March 13, 1820, Wellesley informed Castlereagh that his house had been the proposed object of a mob riot which failed to materialize.[72]

Outspoken favoritism toward the Spanish colonies in Parliament, e.g., Lansdowne's pro-colonial speech on May 26, 1820, could not but help to add more fuel to the fire.[73] To dispel any fears, Castlereagh instructed Wellesley in a letter dated June 2, 1820, to repel the calumnies which circulated in regard to his personal conduct and British opinions.[74] The effectiveness of Wellesley's claims certainly must have been nullified by news of Cochrane's naval

---

70 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 6.
71 Castlereagh, *Memoirs*, XII, 171.
72 *Ibid.*, 221.
73 *Parliamentary Debates*, Second Series, 1820, I, 563–564.
74 Castlereagh, *Memoirs*, XII, 269.

activities in South American waters. On September 26, 1820, Rafael Gravier del Valle wrote to the Minister of Ultramar. He discussed the state of Spanish commerce with America, the damage done by Cochrane and the necessity of protecting the commerce with Spanish ships of war. [75] For example, on August 9, 13, 20, 31, September 1, 16, 19, 1820, the Spanish Cortes debated the question of the revolting colonies and the important issue of trade. Discussion centered around the problem of contraband trade, protection of Spanish commerce, foreign interference and solutions to this pressing issue.[76] Similar debates were held on October 24, November 5, and November 8, 1820.[77]

The general outlook on British South American trade was very bright during the last month of 1821. A flourishing trade existed despite various blockades and Spanish complaints of illegality. Hall's journals of his voyages to South America bore out the value of the new markets. On December 9, 1821, Hall wrote that the shops of Lima were filled with British manufactured goods; merchants of all nations carried on their business; all this to the exclusion of the "indolent" Spaniards.[78]

How would the British Government justify the existence of this rich commerce? As previously mentioned, the concept surrounding the legality of this trade expanded over the period of years covered by this study. It grew to suit the commercial needs of the English nation. On December 8, 1821, a Foreign Office memorandum introduced a further justification for the trade. Spain's earlier assistance to the revolting North American colonies was used to show that present British activities were not innovations in respect to questions involving illegal trade. Moreover, commercial recognition need not disturb the peace between Great Britain and Spain.[79] This opinion became more widespread as recent patriot victories in Mexico, Peru and Columbia bespoke stability. Castlereagh's letter to Sir Charles Bagot, December 14, 1821, commented in this manner.[80]

In the face of the existing trade, the British officials still insisted

---

75 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, V, 82.

76 *Diario de las Actas y Discusiones de las Cortes*, Legislatura de los años de 1820 y 1821, Madrid, 1820, II, 244–245, 344–356, III, 194, IV, 171–192, 214, VI, no. 3, 7–25, no. 7, 2–11.

77 *Ibid.*, X, no. 4, 17–44, XI, no. 6, 29–42, no. 13, 26–32.

78 Captain Basil Hall, *Hall's Voyages*, Extracts from a Journal written on the Coasts of Chili, Peru and Mexico in the years 1820, 1821, 1822, Edinburgh, 1826, II, 51.

79 Edward J. Stapleton, ed., *Some Official Correspondence of George Canning*, London, 1887, I, 96–97.

80 Castlereagh, *Memoirs*, XII, 443.

neutrality was maintained. In a State of the Nation report in 1822, British conduct was examined with the purpose of showing the positive applications of that neutrality. It was admitted this British moderation was severely tried since it was torn between a sense of duty and justice as against personal gain. South American markets offered rich fields for British commerce and the merchants realized Spanish impotence to prevent the trade. Despite the tauntings of mercantile pressure groups and political opposition, the British Government deemed it a national honor, the report explained, to preserve the status of a neutral.[81] Emphasis was placed upon lack of armed assistance to either party as the criterion for judging honor and justice. Commercial activity was glossed over while the claim was advanced that mercantile interests did not guide national policy.

At this point, a brief study of mercantile pressure groups concerning South American trade is necessary for better evaluation of official British policy. On May 9, 1822, the Liverpool Shipowners' Association petitioned the Lords of the Privy Council to improve the commercial relations between Britain and the former Spanish colonies.[82] In a memorial of June 1822, the Liverpool merchants quoted the amount of European goods consumed annually by the colonials at £13,000,000. Such a trade deserved the attention of the British Government. Furthermore, the memorial pointed out that during the period from 1820 to May of 1822 no less than 155 vessels cleared British ports for Buenos Aires, Chile, Peru and Mexico.[83]

On July 20, 1822, John Lowe, merchant, wrote one of his several letters upon the importance of recognizing the South American colonies. Lowe referred to the unpleasant situation in which British trade found itself at the present time due to the uncertain measures adopted by the government. He then stressed the intense interest on the part of British manufacturers and merchants in securing more favorable conditions in the South American trade.[84] These unfavorable circumstances were tolerated for a time but now that a possibility of direct trade existed, these merchants and manufacturers looked with great interest and satisfaction toward an increased demand in ever-expanding markets. They believed it was no longer necessary to ship to expensive intermediary ports. Lowe referred to the

---

81 "The State of the Nation at the Commencement of the Year 1822," *The Pamphlateer*, London, 1822, XX, 42–44 *passim*.

82 Leonard Axel Lawson, *The Relation of British Policy to the Declaration of the Monroe Doctrine*, New York, 1922, 88.

83 *Ibid.*

84 *Ibid.*, 89.

stability which characterized some former Spanish colonies—a stability which promised security in commercial dealings. It was necessary for the British Government to accept the new order of things and act accordingly. Moreover, Spanish commercial regulations did not reflect any of the liberality which would encourage the British Government to hope for better trade relations with that country.[85] Lowe's views reflected the opinion of many traders who favored recognition of the revolted colonies. Hyslop and Company belonged in the above category.[86] The London merchants also took an interest in the great potential of South American markets. A petition dated September 14, 1822, to the Board of Admiralty, demanded better protection for vessels trading to South America by urging a convoy.[87]

In the meantime, British negotiations with the Spanish Government continued along very unsatisfactory lines. Castlereagh's letter to Luis de Onís, June 28, 1822, insisted that neutrality was maintained and denied all rumors concerning exclusive trade privileges.[88] British protests did not quell Spanish apprehensions. Therefore, the Spaniards attempted to solve the colonial commercial problem without the benefit of England's mediation and without any rewarding concessions. On August 3, 1882, the Council of State deliberated upon the June 28, 1822, decree of the Cortes relative to negotiation with the dissident overseas governments in respect to provisional commercial conventions.[89] The following day, a royal order was sent to the political heads of Ultramar regarding the authority of the commissioners in approving the provisional treaties of commerce with the dissidents.[90]

While the Spaniards contemplated a solution to their maritime problem, the British prepared to initiate a new system of trade with the insurgent Spanish colonies. Wellington's letter to Canning, September 21, 1822, referred to a conversation with Monsieur de Villèle upon the following subject. Wellington stated:

I explained to him the relation in which we stood towards those Colonies in a political point of view, as considering them Governments *de facto,* and recognizing their belligerent rights as Powers at war, and in a commercial point of view, in carrying on trade with them for many years under the

85 *Ibid.,* 478–481 *passim.*
86 Duke of Wellington, ed., *Despatches, Correspondence and Memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington,* London, 1867, I, 307.
87 Lawson, *British Policy,* 87.
88 Webster, *Britain and Independence,* II, 387–388.
89 Lanzas, *Independencia de America,* V, 451.
90 *Ibid.,* 453.

British flag. I then explained the alteration in the commercial relation which had taken place in the last Session of Parliament, and the probability that His Majesty's Government might deem it expedient to send persons to those Colonies to transmit reports on which we could rely of the real estate of their relation with the Mother Country, and on which we might found our ulterior measures with respect to them.[91]

This left little doubt as to what the British Government contemplated doing in the near future—despatching commercial consuls to the Spanish colonies. It is further important to note the rather frank admission of a trade with the colonies labelled as illegal by the Spaniards but considered legitimate by the British mercantile interest.

Spanish obstinacy in granting direct trade concessions and the possibility of armed European intervention on the eve of the Congress of Verona, forced Castlereagh to modify his views in respect to the South American issue. In a set of instructions, which he did not live to carry out, he laid out a policy later followed by Canning. Written for his own use and then transferred to Wellington before he proceeded to Verona, Castlereagh made the following observations. He said that if the independent Spanish colonies could maintain themselves despite Spanish attempts to resubjugate them, other powers would recognize them sooner or later. Therefore, Spain should arrange a method of intercourse where she cannot re-establish dominion. Castlereagh differentiated between colonies where a contest still existed; where the struggle was terminated in patriot favor; and where negotiations were still carried on with Spain. With regard to the first and third points Castlereagh said it was unwise to grant recognition. However, with regard to the second point, the British deemed their position justifiable in the recognition of *de facto* governments. Once more Castlereagh admitted the extent of the trade carried on with the Spanish colonies and the impossibility of checking it at this stage of development without great economic burden. He then mentioned the change of policy formulated by Parliament in the form of a relaxation of the Navigation Act. Castlereagh thought British *de facto* recognition entirely in accord with the existing law of nations and enunciated British policy to confine itself solely to this type of recognition for the present time. When formal recognition would be granted was a debatable question.[92]

The modified Navigation Act referred to above owed its passage

---

91 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 73.

92 G. R. Gleig, *History of the Life of Arthur Duke of Wellington*, translated from the French of M. Brialmont, London, 1860, IV, 375–376.

to a decline in the export trade and the desire to promote further commerce with South America. Part iii of the Act permitted direct British importation of foreign goods from all areas which formerly belonged or still were under Spanish domination in ships belonging to those countries.[93]

The commercially-minded British underestimated Spanish determination to suppress what they termed illegal trade. The result was a series of maritime depredations both by the official Spanish navy and irresponsible pirates infesting South American waters. These depredations offended British dignity and forced the adoption of protective measures. On October 15, 1822, Canning wrote to Wellington about the extensive system of piracy and condemnation of two British ships by Spanish authorities on grounds of trading with insurgent colonies. Canning said the British suffered equally from Spain's claim of sovereignty and from the violation of this sovereignty by her lawless subjects. Because England refused to interfere in Spain's domestic problems, it did not necessarily follow that she abandoned her rights to vindicate the depredations.[94] Canning regretted that Spain was unable to suppress the piracy herself and justified British position for taking care of this matter in whatever manner they saw fit. At this point in the study, another factor becomes evident. The British no longer only claimed the legality of South American trade but they furthermore intended to protect it forcibly if necessary. Judging by the tone of Canning's letter, any redress of grievances from Spain herself was uncertain. Thus politely but firmly the Spanish Government was informed of British intentions.

The subject of piracy and Spanish confiscations formed the basis of Canning's letter to William A'Court, British representative at Madrid, October 18, 1822. The letter referred to the capture of the *Lord Collingwood* by the Spanish privateer *Panchita* and its subsequent condemnation in December 1821. Apparently, the owner of the vessel contacted Castlereagh who in turn instructed Mr. Hervey in Spain to insist upon the gross illegality of the above condemnation. Hervey presented a note to the Spanish Secretary of State and received a promise of inquiry into the matter. Based upon the inquiry, on July 16, the Spanish Government pledged to take action "conformable to justice." Hervey again protested to the Spanish Secretary of State about the delay and was informed that no solution had been reached. Canning then informed Court that he was

---

[93] Alexander Brady, *William Huskisson and Liberal Reform*, London, 1928, 90.

[94] Wellington, *Despatches*, I, 357.

to pursue the topic from where Hervey left off and to renew the remonstrances against the outrageous case of illegal capture and condemnation. Canning referred to the extensive archives containing similar grievances either justified or palliated by Spanish officials. However, in no instance was any redress accorded to British claims. The time came for the British to require atonement for the confiscations, particularly in the case of the *Lord Collingwood,* Canning insisted. By referring specifically to the above case, Canning did not mean to infer that commercial oppression during the last six years was to go unnoticed.[95] A summary of the remainder of Canning's instructions is necessary due to the significant pronouncements that it contains. The specific ground on which this vessel was confiscated was the commercial activity it carried on with vessels belonging to Buenos Aires. Canning claimed that Spanish authority in this portion of South America had long ceased to be of consequence. Moreover,

> it has been distinctly and solemnly declared by England, and admitted by Spain, that if England forebore to prejudge the question of a possible amicable settlement between Spain and her ancient colonies, by acknowledging the independent separate existence of the latter, she did so, in the complete understanding and on the condition distinctly admitted by Spain, that her trade with those colonies should be free and unmolested: nay, that Spain should not, even upon the resumption of her authority (if ever she should be able to resume it) resort to the reestablishment of her exclusive system or, if at all, at least not without previous warning, and an equitable allowance of time for the winding up of British commercial concerns.[96]

Whether any such agreement between the two nations existed is unknown. No evidence was found by the writer to substantiate the claim as far as the Spanish Government was concerned. Its validity is based solely upon British interpretation. If Spain persisted in condemning vessels carrying on colonial trade, Canning mentioned two avenues open to the British Government. One would be to acquiesce in Spanish pretensions and the other to legalize the trade by publicly recognizing the Spanish American governments. It was noted the British preferred to follow the latter course. Since unredressed grievances could not be suffered indefinitely, Canning indicated the king's decision to issue orders to the Board of Admiralty to adopt the best measures for protecting British interests. The commander of the Cuba squadron was delegated the responsibility of sweeping the South American waters free of pirates—with or without

95 *Ibid.,* 377–378.
96 *Ibid.,* 378.

the consent and assistance of the Governor of Havana. The magnitude of the piratical injustice, Canning argued, necessitated such action despite a recognized violation of Spanish authority. If the Spanish king admitted the existence of such a necessity it would be most agreeable to the British. Court was especially warned to assure the Spanish minister that there was no intimation of hostility or unfriendliness meant by the British decision to protect its maritime activities. Canning then stated that the British king had no desire to interfere in the domestic concerns of Spain.[97] Such a statement, in view of British activity in South America, is open to question. In conclusion, the October 18 letter to Court warned the Spanish that if British commercial interests were injured without some redress, recognition might be decided upon as the best mode to prevent future depredations. If Spain continued to leave unchecked the piratical activities complained of for such a long time, her complacency forfeited her right to complain about the resulting recognition.[98]

On October 29, 1822, Canning wrote to Wellington that persistent efforts to secure redress went unheard. Instead of becoming more liberal, each successive Spanish Government imposed more of the old monopolistic system upon British interests. Once again Canning stated that an agreement existed whereby Spain would not consider British trade with the colonies a breach of obligation. He further insisted England adhered to her neutral position and in return was visited with new confiscations and condemnations. Spanish reluctance to indemnify the British and prevent further violations justified British recognition.[99] Mention was then made to a memorandum drawn up by Robinson, at the Board of Trade, sketching such commercial engagements as would be advisable if recognition was accorded to the South American colonies.[100] The whole tone of Canning's letter was such as to imply recognition as an event in the not too distant future. Thus another step in British policy was reached. The British now contemplated recognition as a means to give further security to their commercial enterprise. Spain still refused to grant direct trade. The British determined otherwise.

The memorandum referred to in Canning's letter, and as discussed above, shed further light on British intentions. A question was raised whether in negotiating recognition with the Spanish colonies effort

97 *Ibid.*, 378–379.
98 *Ibid.*, 380.
99 *Ibid.*, 463–464.
100 *Ibid.*, 466.

should be made to obtain any exclusive or specific commercial advantages as a condition for recognition. The memorandum denied the justice and political wisdom of such action. Such a procedure would destroy the impression given by the British that they did not wish for exclusive trade privileges and thereby arouse the animosity of other interested powers. Moreover, the colonials themselves might not consent to any such agreement.[101]

British determination to employ a naval force to protect commerce became a matter of serious concern at Madrid. Under pressure, the Spanish ministry promised to grant satisfaction for the ships which had been captured and to withdraw prohibitions against British trade with the Americas.[102] Canning doubted Spanish intentions and unswervingly adhered to his policy of sending consular agents to protect British interests. He dictated a memorandum for the Cabinet, November 15, 1822, supposedly justifying the necessity for sending commercial or civil agents with that purpose in mind. The safeguarding of British rights of self-defense positively required the residence of such agents at the principal ports of each of the South American states. Secondly, British merchants clamored for such protection. Furthermore,

> The overbearing arrogance of Spain no longer acquiesces in our neutrality. Our ships are seized and confiscated, not because they violate blockade or have enemy's goods on board, but simply because they trade with the Colonies. The tacit compact which subsisted for years by which Spain was to forbear from interrupting our trade, in compensation for our forbearance to recognize her Colonies, is now forgotten or renounced by Spain, and the old Colonial system is revived in as full vigour as if she had still a practical hold over her Colonies, and had a navy to enforce her pretensions.[103]

The use of the phrase "tacit compact" is important since it proved to be one of the foundations of British claims to trade with the colonies. From this point on to recognition in 1825, the British insisted that the Spaniards had granted the right to trade in an unwritten gentleman's agreement but were never able to produce evidence to substantiate their claims. The Spanish denied the existence of any such agreement.

In another section of the November 19 memorandum, Canning stated that the only course open to do away with all pretext for Spanish enforcement of obsolete monopolistic pretensions was recognition. He doubted whether the Spanish Government could ever

101 *Ibid.*, 467.
102 Lawson, *British Policy*, 98.
103 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 394–396.

regain her jurisdiction in the independent states. Since there were considerable British interests in Peru, merchants demanded some type of superintendence. He further claimed the Spanish Government had complete knowledge of British plans through Onís and was, therefore, prepared to receive the final decisions.[104]

Canning issued another memorandum on Spanish colonial issues dated November 24, 1822. Further reference was made to the unwritten agreement with Spain over commercial privileges. A brief history of British representations to the Spanish Government was also included. Suggestions regarding mediation and pacification received minute attention. However, he argued, the rapid progress of events in the New World was such that British policy must conform to the welfare of the country.[105]

Once British policy was decided upon, it had to be justified in the eyes of the legitimacy-minded European powers. Wellington's role at Verona paved the way, to a certain extent, for what was to follow in 1823 and 1825. Writing Metternich on December 1, 1822, Wellington indicated that the Spanish Government proposed to discuss measures for reconciling the two nations but there was no mention of a treaty of commerce. If a treaty of commerce had been proposed by the Cortes, it certainly would be directed at reconciling Britain to crisis-plagued Spain.[106]

While Canning played with the possibility of some type of recognition for the independent Spanish colonies, his positive efforts were directed toward the establishment of commercial agents with a consular character at the various ports in which British subjects carried on commercial activity. On December 9, 1822, Canning informed Court of the urgency of such a step. He resolved to take no further action toward a political recognition thus giving Spain an opportunity to consent to such a move. Canning's explanation was that British forbearance would aid negotiations in behalf of the colonials and incline Spain to seek British mediation with France, which at this time weighed heavily upon Spanish brows.[107]

Little if no documentation is available regarding the Spanish reaction to British policy as enunciated during 1822. There was no indication that the Spanish Government agreed with the British interpretation of the "tacit compact" theory. Proof exists that efforts were made to alleviate some of the colonial complaints in respect

104 *Ibid.*, 394–396.
105 *Ibid.*, 76–77.
106 Wellington, *Despatches,* I, 622–623.
107 Webster, *Britain and Independence,* II, 401.

to commerce. A December 14, 1822, confidential note to D. José Gorossarri discussed the methods to be adopted for the pacification of the American provinces with an eye to the economic situation.[108]

Although Court previously informed San Miguel that no decided step was taken to nominate consuls or commercial agents to South American ports, Canning's letter to Court dated December 28,1822, contradicted that view. Canning enclosed an extract of a communication from the Board of Trade listing the ports and places to which it was necessary to send agents of some description to look after the welfare of British trade. Even if Britain maintained friendlier relations with Spain, Canning reiterated, it would be difficult to acknowledge a title which no longer could be enforced.[109]

> M. de San Miguel has himself confessed . . . what, indeed, is abundantly evident, that it is utterly hopeless for the Mother Country to look to the practical re-establishment of that exclusive system, which still exists in her law with respect to her late possessions in America. He has the candour to admit that the time is come when Spain, instead of dreaming of bringing back the practice to the law, must, so far as relates to her maritime jurisdiction on the American coast, conform her law to the necessity which defeats her practice; and, if this be true with respect to the coast which her flag has still the power of visiting, imagination can hardly suggest a course of measures by which she could ever hope to recover her authority over the interior of those immense countries, so as to clear them of the foreign commercial establishments, which have grown up there during the period while those Provinces have been achieving their Independence.[110]

Court was instructed to inform San Miguel of the contents of the enclosed papers relative to the appointment of consular agents. Moreover, Court was to suggest to San Miguel that Spanish governmental approbation of this step would be highly satisfactory prior to the appointment of the above-mentioned agents.[111] The preceding letter revealed certain important items. It showed the attitude of one Spanish official in regard to Spain's colonial future. Secondly, it evidenced a degree of concern, small as it was, for Spanish approbation in regard to sending consular agents to South American ports no longer under Spanish control. Lastly, it indicated that a positive step had been taken to safeguard British commerce by means of the consular agents.

Relations with the Spanish Government apparently experienced rejuvenation—a successful one judging by the amicable settlement

---

108 Lanzas, *Independencia de America*, V, 489.
109 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 401–402.
110 *Ibid.*, 402.
111 *Ibid.*

made in March of 1823. Canning's letter to Stuart, January 10, 1823, spoke of the likely redress which Spain considered granting to Britain. Once the Spanish Minister gave assurance the matter of indemnifications was to be considered by the Cortes, directions were given to withdraw the British protecting squadron cruising the West Indies. Canning hoped there would be no future need for re-issuing such orders. Apparently, the threat of force alone was sufficient to bring about the desired objective.[112]

On January 9, 1823, Spain liberalized her commercial regulations. Trade to all provinces was granted to those nations with which the Spanish Government deemed convenient for a ten month period commencing from the date of publication. The January 9 decree also referred to the settlement of British claims.[113] On January 31, 1823, the Cortes issued another decree relative to foreign trade with Spain and her colonies.[114]

The next British victory came in the form of a convention signed by both powers on March 12, 1823. This agreement satisfactorily settled British claims arising from confiscations during the past seven years. The following are some of the principles decided upon in the convention. (1) A mixed commission consisting of two representatives each from Britain and Spain was to be appointed and was to meet in London within two weeks after the convention was signed. It was the duty of the above commission to decide upon the cases brought before it dealing with captured or seized British goods and ships dating as far back as July 4, 1808. Similar arrangements were made respecting Spanish goods and ships. (2) A sum of 40,000 reales was placed at the disposal of the commissioners to be used in settling the claims. This sum was to decrease or increase with necessity. (3) Spanish claims were to be paid by the British Government either in stock or money. (4) Only claims submitted within the first six months during which the commissioners deliberated would be admitted for consideration. The Anglo-Spanish convention proved to be a decisive British victory. The British interpreted the payment of their claims as an admission of the legality of their trade. This interpretation eventually became one of the bases used by the British to justify direct trade with the Spanish colonies. It must be remembered that while the Spanish were will-

112 *Ibid.*, II, 111.

113 *Coleccion de Las Decretos y Ordenes Generales Espedidos por Las Cortes Extraordinarias,* Que comprende desde 3 de Octubre de 1822 hasta 19 de Febrero de 1823, Madrid, 1823, X, 79–80.

114 *British State Papers,* 1822–1823, 1034.

ing to arrange some modifications in their maritime laws, they still did not concede unlimited foreign free trade with their former colonies and those still under their domination.

Spain's indemnification formed part of Canning's speech to the House of Commons, April 14, 1823. Taking into consideration the fairly peaceful condition of Spain and Europe, Canning said the British Government deemed it advisable to call Spain's attention to an undeniable fact—Spain's inability to resubjugate the colonies. On this basis, Canning suggested Spain's recognition of colonial independence with a stipulation granting the mother country certain advantages. Canning stated such information had already been sent on to Madrid with the further notation that British desired no exclusive trade concessions with the Colonies in question.[115]

The reaction in Spain to the claims convention is also worth noting. It was entirely within the realm of possibility that Spain would resent the fairly large settlement she had to make. British interpretation of this convention also proved highly irritating. However, the April 24, 1823, memorial of the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Cortes indicated another trend of thought. The memorial claimed friendly relations with Britain and referred to the amicable settlement respecting seizure of British merchant vessels, etc.[116]

No sooner was the ink on the claims agreement dry, when the British mercantile interests loudly clamored for political recognition. One letter destined to exert influence upon Canning was sent by the merchant Lowe who claimed recognition would eliminate the necessity for contraband trade.[117] Pressure to recognize the independent South American colonies or establish consular agents also came from other directions, e.g., the London merchants, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, Belfast Chamber of Commerce and the London Times.[118] Contemporaries like Goldsmith expressed similar views.[119] Although recognition of South American colonies was postponed, Canning decided to take concrete steps to protect British commercial interests in this region. Within the first days of

---

115 *Parliamentary Debates*, New Series, VIII, 890–891.

116 *British State Papers*, 1822–1823, 972.

117 John Lowe, "A Letter to the Right Hon. George Canning on the Policy of Recognizing the Independence of the South American States," *The Pamphlateer*, XXI, London, 1823, 407–408.

118 Lawson, *British Policy*, 87–92.

119 Lewis Goldsmith, "Observations on the Appointment of the Right Hon. Geo. Canning to the Foreign Department and on its Effects on the State of Society in England and on European Politics," *The Pamphlateer*, XXII, London, 1823, 330-333.

October 1823, he appointed commercial consuls to various South American ports.[120]

While the appointment of commercial consuls did not stress political recognition, Canning's discussion with Prince de Polignac, in October of 1823 initiated sentiments of a different character. Discussion of the Canning-Polignac memorandum follows. Canning said the British were of the opinion that Spain was completely helpless to regain her South American colonies and all negotiations to reunite the parent and colony would prove unsuccessful. While the British would not place any obstacles to prevent negotiations of this nature coming from Spain, Canning stated foreign assistance to Spain against the colonies would be liable to British veto. He disclaimed British territorial expansion in South America and stressed commercial intercourse with the former Spanish colonies. Then the question of recognition was mentioned. Since the British Government was convinced that Spain's colonial system could not be restored, the British could not bind themselves in any agreement which either refused or forestalled such recognition of the South American states.[121] Canning characterized Spanish pretensions to interdict foreign trade to the colonies as obselete and wholly inapplicable to the British. He referred to the basis upon which the British were entitled to carry on South American trade. Canning believed such a privilege was conceded to Great Britain in 1810 when Spain asked for British mediation. In return for this mediation, Spain offered commercial privileges. Although Spain did not employ British mediation, Canning decided it was not practicable for Britain to withdraw her invested capital in South America nor to cease an existent trade. He argued it was distinctly understood that South American trade was open to British subjects, and that Spanish laws restricting this trade were "tacitly repealed." British demands for redress for confiscations were based upon this concession.[122] Canning's interpretation of a tacit agreement with Spain formed part of British justification for carrying on South American trade. His interpretation is sufficiently important to warrant additional treatment.

Following the publication of the memorandum on March 4, 1824, Canning's friend Sir James Mackintosh asked him about the treaty

120 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, I, 351.

121 Harold Temperley and Lillian M. Penson, eds., *Foundations of British Foreign Policy*, From Pitt (1792) to Salisbury (1902), Documents Old and New, Cambridge, 1938, 71.

122 *Ibid.*, 72–73.

which supposedly embodied the above mentioned "tacit repeal." Canning admitted there was no treaty in existence which did contain a review of Spanish commercial concessions to Britain. As regards the 1810 agreement, Canning remarked it was only an "understanding" between the two nations. This "understanding" included suspension of Spanish coastal laws as far as intercourse between the subjects of both nations were concerned. Canning stated there was no written instrument to substantiate such a claim.[123] Mackintosh asked a further question concerning a decree published by Ferdinand VII authorizing British trade to South America. Canning denied knowledge of such a decree and stated he knew of its existence "only as a matter of public notoriety."

Question arises whether or not Canning had any actual proof of Spanish concessions. One author claimed that he did since Canning would not publicly make a statement which could be refuted by Spain. Moreover, such Spanish refutation was not forthcoming. Spain's willingness to pay her claims in 1822 was judged as further evidence by the author to substantiate Canning's statements.[124] This author stated

> the Spanish Government signed a convention to give redress for seizures of certain British vessels engaged in this Spanish colonial trade. By doing that she certainly gave not a "tacit," but an official and open, permission to England for this trade. Canning need not have gone back further than this year (1822) if he wished to establish the formal right.[125]

Still another historian claimed that a July 1810 edict printed in Cádiz, signed by the Minister of Finance, threw open South American trade to all nations not at war with Spain. However, the minister's signature was evidently obtained by fraud. Subsequently, the Minister was dismissed after the Junta disavowed the legality of the edict. Canning might have read this edict with the assumption of its genuine nature but discovered his error later on. His actions proved he was not prepared to quote or defend the edict as a document in British possession and proof of commercial concessions.[126]

Another group of historians who edited the Polignac Memorandum devised a third interpretation of Canning's announcement of a "tacit" agreement. These observations follow. When pressed in Parliament, Canning denied the existence of any treaty granting commercial concessions. He said there was merely a "gentleman's agree-

123 *Ibid.*, 523.
124 *Ibid.*, 523–524.
125 *Ibid.*, 524, Miss Goebel.
126 *Ibid.*, Miss Horsfall.

ment" that England could trade without official permission. This same idea applies to Canning's statement about its being "distinctly understood" that Spain's coastal laws were "tacitly repealed." Inference was made that the Spanish Government, in 1809, might have admitted an informal understanding whereby she would wink at British trade in return for mediation. This idea, however, cannot be found in official documents. Only private papers showed a slight trace of this suggestion. This third group of historians suggested the possibility that Spain's weakening position at home might have forced an unofficial concession to save face. Tacit winking at British colonial trade would have protected the Spanish Government from internal criticism and at the same time satisfied British traders with vested interests in South America. The convention of 1822 was interpreted as acknowledging the existence of the "tacit compact" accorded British trade during earlier years. Why spain never contested Canning's statement was strange, the historians remarked. The obvious reason, they said, was that Spain did not wish to raise the question concerning the consent to trade because it meant revealing earlier negotiations with the British. Canning knew Spain could not afford to do this in 1823. The possibility also existed that Henry Wellesley supplied Canning with information about the 1810 decree and the "tacit" consent without support of documents. Since Wellesley was a close friend of Canning's, such an explanation was not too extreme. The historians concluded that Canning never would have published a memorandum not based on "fact."[127]

As is evident from the above discussion, pre-1815 edicts and "tacit" agreements were used by the British to sanction the trade carried on in South American markets. Several remarks made by the historians just discussed need amplification. For example, the statement that Spain never refuted British claims needs modifications. Secondly, Canning's reference to a "tacit" agreement could be explained in another manner. Perhaps the Spanish did offer concessions in return for mediation. Once the mediation was forsaken for one reason or another, the Spanish believed the other half of the agreement null and void. Particularly referring to 1815-1818 offers of mediation, the fact that Spain did not avail herself of British mediation, did not, perhaps, in the eyes of the British, mean the reward for that mediation was also voided. This same interpretation could have applied in 1810. Numerous other questions arise concerning historical interpretation of the commercial concessions issue.

[127] *Ibid.*, 525–526, Temperley and Penson.

What motivated Spain to acknowledge British protestations of seizures in 1822? Was it due to a realization of the legality of British claims or due to other elements, e.g., the weakened position of the country and the French threat? Did Canning have any actual proof to back his statements or was his argument based on Wellesley's communications? Did any such unwritten "tacit compact" exist? Most of the information comes from British sources. Thus far, no concrete Spanish documentation of any "tacit" agreement between Spain and Great Britain has been found to corroborate British interpretation.

What was Spanish reaction to British activity and declarations of the last few months? On November 8, 1823, Court wrote to Canning recounting a plan formed by the Spanish Government to establish the South American Company. The ultimate objective of this company was to recover control over the now independent and disobedient colonies. According to Court, this South American Company was to be formed through shares supposedly bought by European monied men. Spain proposed to give great commercial privileges to this company and allot mines as the security for recovering the colonies. The various expeditions to suppress the colonials were to proceed under the direction of this company, although technically they would be carried on in the name of the Spanish king. This project, as Court said, was a favorite topic of discussion in Madrid. However, no decision regarding the actual establishment of the company was made.[128]

There was some indication that certain members of the Spanish Government favored a relaxation of monopolistic commercial regulations. Court wrote to Canning on January 14, 1824, about a conversation with M. de Ofalia. According to Court, Ofalia stated

> that our [British] political interests as a monarchy were decidedly on the side of Spain in this question, [separation of colonies from Spain] and that with respect to our commercial interests, there was nothing we could ask that Spain would not be ready to grant; that orders had even already been sent to every place where the King's authority was respected, to interfere in no way with the British commerce.[129]

The truth of the above statement could not be positively established by the writer. However, it is important because it illustrated Spain's willingness to form closer and friendlier relations with Britain.

---

[128] Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 405.
[129] *Ibid.*, 411–412.

Whether this change of heart was due to a genuine belief in liberalizing commerce or forced by recent British policy, e.g., Polignac Memorandum and appointment of consuls, is impossible to say.

While Spain sought British friendship she still looked with fond glances at the possibility of restoring her colonies through armed foreign intervention. The Spanish suggested a conference with foreign powers to take place in Paris. Upon receipt of the Spanish invitation, Canning told Bagot in a January 22, 1824, letter, that there would be no conference with the British in it.[130] He referred to the proposed conference in his letter to Court on January 30, 1824, making the following statement:

> The subjects of His Majesty have for many years carried on trade and formed commercial connections in all the American Provinces which have declared their separation from Spain. This trade was originally opened with the consent of the Spanish Government. It has grown gradually to such an extent as to require some direct protection by the establishment at several ports and places in those Provinces of Consuls on the part of this country: a measure long deferred out of delicacy to Spain, and not resorted to at last without long previous notification to the Spanish Government.[131]

Once more Canning referred to Spanish consent but did not back his reasoning with documentation. He still indicated Britain would be willing to mediate Spanish colonial differences but only upon a liberal basis, which included a revision of Spain's maritime regulations.[132]

Realization that Spain was not likely to liberalize her monopolistic control over her former colonies stimulated a feverish demand for early recognition of the stable, independent governments in South America. The contemporary periodicals together with mercantile groups spurred this movement on in Parliament. Additional driving force came from the members of Parliament itself, e.g., Earl of Liverpool. Canning favored the use of commercial treaties as a means to effect *de facto* recognition.[133] On December 31, 1824, he told Bagot that only one course was open to the British—recognition.[134]

Canning no longer attempted to justify British commercial activity solely as an end in itself. He now wanted to grant recognition for

---

130 Josceline Bagot, *George Canning and His Friends*, London, 1909, II, 222.
131 Webster, *Britain and Independence*, II, 414.
132 *Ibid.*
133 *Ibid.*, 431.
134 Bagot, *Canning and Friends*, II, 277.

a wider, more significant purpose—the acknowledgement of a series of new governments. With the *de facto* recognition of the South American states came greater security for British commerce. Canning urged mediation but on another basis—Spanish recognition of the new South American republics. All controversy over British rights to trade with the South American colonies gave way to a more important decision of recognition. On January 1, 1825, England recognized the independence of the South American states. Thus, Canning "called a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old."[135]

Once recognition was accorded to the South American governments, Canning proceeded to arrange a series of commercial treaties. One of the important facts evident in the above treaties is that no effort was made to obtain exclusive trade privileges. In this respect, the British were consistent. Even after the British recognized the independent political existence of certain South American governments and concluded commercial treaties with them, Spain refused to admit the legality of these last two measures. Whatever the reason, Spain was unable to enforce her position.

The following conclusions are evident from the study. (1) Expediency characterized British foreign and commercial policy, modified to suit the changing status of the South American colonies and the needs of British commercial interests. Relations between Spain and Britain at times were friendly and on other occasions most unsatisfactory. Under a pretext of friendship there was much animosity and bitter feeling. (2) British policy, under the constant watchfulness of Castlereagh and Canning, developed in the following manner. All during the 1815 and 1825 period, Britishers claimed the right to trade with the Spanish colonies. The Spaniards denied the existence of any such right. There was no written document whereby the British position could be verified. To prove that such a right existed, the British referred to a "tacit compact" dating back as far as 1810 wherein the Spanish commercial laws restricting trade were supposedly repealed. Spain, through the Cortes and Ferdinand VII, denied this.

After 1815, Spain renewed her promise to grant trade concessions as a reward for British mediation. Although the mediation was never carried out, the British insisted they were entitled to the "reward." The mediation fell through basically because Britain

135 Wellesley, *Diary and Correspondence*, 131.

refused to use force to reunite the colonies to Spain. Spain insisted that the trade concessions would be granted only upon successful completion of the mediation.

When it became increasingly apparent that Spain could no longer control the revolting colonies nor effect a successful blockade of South American ports, the British branded the blockade as illegal. Spain protested and turned in the direction of the legitimacy-minded European powers for intervention. The possibility of such intervention speeded the adoption of measures designed to protect British commercial interests already flourishing in South America. Pressure from mercantile groups was strong and aided the passage of legislation.

The cries from vested commercial interests further resulted in the sending of naval squadrons to rid the South American waters of Spanish privateers and pirates. Spain objected to what she termed illegal trade and made efforts to cripple British commerce. The resulting confiscations of merchant vessels brought forth British protests. After a period of applied pressure, Spain acknowledged British grievances and paid the indemnity. The Spanish settlement was interpreted, by the British, as admission of the right to trade.

Time proved that greater protection was necessary if British commerce was to continue to grow without continual interference from Spain. It became more evident to the British that Spain would not grant unrestricted direct trade and even if she did, it would still not be secure. Canning then used the theory of *de facto* recognition for independent South American states. By 1825, Canning decided to grant this recognition by means of commercial treaties. Spain refused to acknowledge the independence of the colonies and did so only after many more years of controversy with the colonials. Spanish objections mattered little to the British who achieved their objective. Recognition sealed the legality of direct trade to South America.

BERNADINE PIETRASZEK

Loyola University, Chicago

The Frontier Army Officer, 1794-1814

A recent writer, concerned with the subject of "blind spots" in the historiography of the trans-Mississippi west, emphasizes the need for research on subjects pertaining to the recent past: agriculture, the railroads, mining, industry, banking, lumbering, and the tourist trade. This authority considers the subject of military history as having been adequately treated.[1] It is the thesis of the present study that more attention should be given to the role of military and related civilian personnel in the development of the frontier community. This paper attempts to portray the status of the frontier army officer in the period indicated, with emphasis on his relation to the civilian community.

Then, as now, the authority of the army officer rested upon an executive commission granted by the president. In contrast to present methods of procurement, practically all commissions were granted upon direct application by the candidate. Frequently, it would seem, a candidate owed his success more to the efforts of his political friends than to his own qualifications.[2] The relative rank of officers of the same grade was determined by lottery.[3] Then, as now, a commissioned officer could resign his commission, but in the small army of that day the resignation of a captain might be so important a matter that the secretary of war would make special

---

Editor's Note: This study was made possible, in part, by research grants from Southern Illinois University.

1 John Walton Caughey, "The Mosaic of Western History," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXXIII, No. 4, 595–606.

2 Thus in 1810 a civilian candidate applied for a field appointment, accompanying his application with letters from the attorney general of the United States, two senators, and ten members of the House of Representatives! Dr. Alexander Macauley to Secretary of War, 22 March, 1810, War Office, Letters Received, V, 260. Another applicant for a captain's commission submitted recommendations from thirty different persons. Curtis Price to Secretary of War, 4 January, 1812, *ibid.*, VI, 367. See also Ferdinand L. Claiborne to Governor Holmes, 7 September, 1811, in C. E. Carter (Ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 20 vols., Washington, 1934–, VI, 221–222 (cited hereafter as "Carter"). Unless otherwise stated references in this paper are to materials in the Old Records Section, Adjutant General's Office, The National Archives.

3 General Philip Reade, "Partial Military Biography and Alphabetical Arrangement of Officers of the Legion of the United States . . . ," unpublished manuscript in the Filson Club, Louisville, Ky. (referred to henceforth as "Reade MS."), 409 ff.

arrangements to keep him in the service.[4] Officers planning to resign generally put out their bids for civilian employment previous to their leaving the army.[5]

It is safe to conclude that, compared with the average person in the frontier community, the frontier officer was among the *élite* in respect to education. Officers were generally competent in language and learning, though undoubtedly very few of these men were, like William Henry Harrison, products of college training and students of history.[6] West Point, though opened in 1802, did not in this period contribute heavily to the education of army officers. In that period a knowledge of the elementary branches was all that was necessary for admittance to the highest military school.[7] The only required reading for western officers was the Articles of War. In 1806 a revision of this code was made and copies were distributed to all commands.[8] In 1809 the War Office also distributed to the posts Alexander Macomb's *Martial Law*.[9]

Army officers dressed resplendently. In 1796 certain changes were made in the direction of simplicity, but gold and silver epaulets, embroidered cuffs and pockets, and plumes continued in use.[10] A captain in 1804 paid sixty-six dollars for a uniform coat, this including freight charges from Philadelphia.[11] Such a coat must have been

---

[4] See Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 27 July, 1805, in Carter, XIII, 167; Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 16 October, 1805, *ibid.*, 240.

[5] See Rufus Easton to the Attorney General, 13 March, 1806, Carter, VI, 121; Governor Holmes to Capt. E. P. Gaines, 28 September, 1810, *ibid.*, VII, 347; James W. Silver, *Edmund Pendleton Gaines*, New Orleans, 1949, 28.

[6] Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, in revising Harrison's inaugural address, said the old general had killed " 'seventeen Roman proconsuls as dead as smelts'." H. J. Webster, "William Henry Harrison's Administration of Indiana Territory," *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, IV, No. 1, 183–184.

[7] See Jonathan Jennings to James Monroe, 27 January, 1813, in Dorothy Riker, "Unedited Letters of Jonathan Jennings," *ibid.*, X, No. 4, 147–278.

[8] Secretary of War to Commanding Officers, 19 May, 1806, War Office, Military Book, III, 15. For the Articles of War as revised see Alexander Macomb, *A Treatise on Martial Law and Courts-Martial; as practised in the United States of America*, Charleston, 1809.

[9] Same to Commanding Officer, Fort Massac, 8 June, 1809, War Office, Military Book, IV, 131.

[10] For a description of the uniforms of the period see W. A. Ganoe, *The History of the United States Army*, New York, 1936, 106. Evidently division and area commanders could also prescribe the uniform to be worn. See Orders, Cantonment Washington, 6 August, 1810, in Post Revolutionary War Records, Vol. 155 (cited hereafter as "Orders, Cantonment Washington").

[11] Entry in Morrison Day Book, 3 April–17 November, 1804, 104 (dated 13 October, 1804), Morrison Papers, Chester Public Library, Chester, Illinois. This valuable collection is composed of the daily journals of the Bryan and Morrison general store at Kaskaskia.

impressive to the homely-clad frontiersman, and worn, as it was, by an officer whose pay was only thirty-five dollars per month. Indeed, the cloth coat was the imprimatur of the military gentleman.[12] This same coat and its epaulets must have been a great temptation to hostile Indians.[13]

The wardrobe of the frontier officer could be elaborate. The inventory of clothing and other possessions of Captain Jesse Lukens, who died at Wilkinsonville in 1801, reveals the following:

3 uniform coats, two laced
4 other coats, including a surcoat
9 pairs fine breeches
18 pairs "overhalls" and other breeches
15 vests, some in silk and scarlet
3 hats, including one fur cap
3 pairs boots, long and short
9 pairs silk stockings

This same officer evidently blew his nose on silk handkerchiefs, slept on a regular four-poster bed and mattress under rose-colored blankets, three of which are mentioned, and ate off white tablecloths. His household furnishings were quite expensive, while his personal possessions included a set of portable type for printing and a case of mathematical instruments. He had no books, but possessed sixteen pictures, seven large and nine small. The total assessed valuation of his personal property was $437.72.[14] While it cannot be assumed that every western officer lived after the style of Captain Lukens, his case shows what one with a flair for dress could do on the frontier of that period.

---

12 The English traveller, Blane, tells a story of General Scott drinking a toast to a Kentuckian, whom, by his coat, he took to be an officer. The Kentuckian, however, assured the General that he had never held a commission. "'Well then, by heavens!' said the old general, 'you are the first man in Kentucky that ever wore a cloth coat, and was not a commissioned officer'." William Newnham Blane, *An Excursion Through the United States and Canada during the Years 1822–1823*, London, 1824, 111–112.

13 Judge Harry Toulmin of Mississippi Territory, referring to Choctaw hostility to Americans, tells how officers concealed their epaulets to avoid becoming targets for the Indians. Judge Toulmin to William Lattimore, 12 November, 1815, Carter, VI, 567.

14 "Inventory of Clothing, Furniture &c the Property of the late Captain Jesse Lukens, deceased, with their appraised Value . . . as appraised . . . At Wilkinson Ville this 24th day of May 1801" (photostat in the hands of the author). The late Theodore Calvin Pease, in a conversation with the author, once expressed himself as completely unable to explain what Alphonse de la Buissonnière, an eighteenth century French officer in the Illinois Country, could have been doing with over 100 shirts. See Natalia Mareé Belting, *Kaskaskia Under the French Régime*, Urbana, 1948, 50.

The commissioned officer was allowed a personal servant, either in the person of a slave or of a soldier from the ranks. Servants were rationed at the public expense.[15] Officers posted in slave states or territories were encouraged to purchase a slave rather than to take servants from the ranks.[16]

The officer, then as now, found it hard to live upon his salary, even though that salary placed him among the "moneyed class" in a community where "hard money" was at a premium.[17] Added to his regular salary were perquisites such as having his baggage moved free of charge.[18] Henry Dearborn, Jefferson's first secretary of war, was said to have been unpopular with the officers (many of whom were Federalists in politics), chiefly because of "a somewhat narrow disposition in settling accounts. . . ."[19] Officers assigned to special duty, such as the work of an adjutant or of a quartermaster, received a small additional remuneration, this varying in accordance with the size of the military unit to which the officer was attached.[20]

---

15 Duplicate rations for military servants were, however, forbidden by an order of 1794. General Orders, 28 January, 1794, Wayne Orderly Book, IV, 113, manuscript in the Filson Club, Louisville, Kentucky. (Unless otherwise indicated future references to the Wayne Orderly Books are made to these volumes and not to printed versions.) See also Secretary of War to Paymaster General, 1 November, 1808, War Office, Military Book, III, 438; same to same, 12 November, 1811, *ibid.*, V, 233.

16 Secretary of War to Seth Hunt, 10 November, 1804, Carter, XIII, 73.

17 The pay scale for officers and men as fixed in 1785–1787 was as follows:

Lieutenant Colonels Commandant	$50 per month.
Majors	$45 per month.
Captains	$35 per month.
Lieutenants	$26 per month.
Ensigns	$20 per month.
Surgeons	$45 per month.
Surgeon's Mates	$30 per month.
Sergeants	$ 6 per month.
Corporals	$ 5 per month.
Musicians	$ 5 per month.
Privates	$ 4 per month.

In lieu of subsistence majors and lieutenant colonels got $20 per month, captains $12, lieutenants, ensigns, and surgeon's mates $8. A surgeon got $16 per month in lieu of subsistence. Forage allowances amounted to $12 per month for majors and $6 per month for company officers and surgeons. "Military Force in 1789," *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, I, 5, (cited hereafter as "ASP, *Mil. Aff.*").

18 Secretary of War to Seth Hunt, 10 November, 1804, Carter, XIII, 72–73.

19 Benjamin Henry Latrobe, *The Journal of Latrobe, Being the Notes and Sketches of an Architect, Naturalist and Traveller in the United States from 1796 to 1820,* New York, 1905, 266.

20 In 1808 a maximum of $8 per month was allowed for these duties. Secretary of War to Governor Hull, 22 January, 1808, Carter, X, 178.

The frontier officer did not fail to urge the government to raise his salary. In 1805, a "Round Robin" of officers at St. Louis, petitioned for an increase in pay, pointing out that "the present price of almost every article necessary for their use is threefold what it could be purchased for in the United States in 1792. . . ."[21] Captain E. P. Gaines once complained that economical officers "have frequently to witness that, young lads in a compting House, who measured the cloth for their Regimental Coats; charged the amount,—and perhaps called frequently in vain for payment,—receive a much larger salary than the officers themselves." Gaines added that a captain's pay in Mississippi Territory was at that time "totally inadequate to his comfortable support. . . ."[22] In 1807 a substantial increase in military pay was granted.[23]

The officer might receive advances on his pay, as General Wilkinson once received an anticipation of six months.[24] Another convenience to the officer was the arrangement whereby his wife or other dependents might be given a part or all of his pay, which anticipated the present system of allotments to dependents.[25]

One of the means whereby the frontier officer might increase his income was through holding civil offices. Thus he might serve as a civil magistrate in taking oaths and depositions or as the fore-

---

[21] "Memorial to Congress by Thomas Hunt and Other Army Officers," 8 November, 1805, Carter, XIII, 267–268.

[22] Captain E. P. Gaines to Secretary of War, 15 April, 1808, Carter, V, 625.

[23] The new pay scale was established as follows:

Rank	*Pay per month*	*Forage Allowance*	*Rations per day*
Colonels	$75	$12	$6
Lt. Colonels	$60	$11	$5
Majors	$50	$10	$4
Surgeons	$45	$10	$3
Surgeon's Mates	$30	$ 6	$2
Adjutants	$10	$ 6	—
Captains	$40	—	$3
First Lieutenants	$30	—	$2
Second Lieutenants	$25	—	$2
Ensigns	$20	—	$2
Music Teachers	$ 9	—	$1
Sergeants	$10	—	$1
Corporals	$ 8	—	$1
Musicians	$ 8	—	$1
Privates	$ 7	—	$1

"Estimates of the expenses of a Regiment of Infantry, per annum, . . . 1807," ASP, *Mil. Aff.*, I, 225.

[24] Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 16 January, 1809, Military Book, IV, 13.

[25] Secretary of War to Mrs. Ann Wilkinson, 18 April, 1803, War Office, Military Book, 10 November, 1803 — 17 November, 1803, 451.

man of a coroner's jury.[26] Again, the post commandant might serve as postmaster in lieu of a civilian.[27]

Another important civilian post sometimes occupied by the military commandant was that of collector of internal revenue. This arrangement was found at posts which were ports of entry *vis-à-vis* Spanish or British Territory. Thus Fort Massac was made a port of entry in 1799. Though the first collector at that post was a civilian, the office was given in 1802 to Captain Daniel Bissell, the post commandant, whose military status was not affected. In case of his transfer to another post Bissell might appoint an agent to do the work.[28] It is evident that military control over such a position was not always pleasing to the local civilians, especially to those concerned with financial and commercial enterprise.[29] There was also the case of Lieutenant Andrew Marschalk, who, while still in the army, became the first printer for Mississippi Territory, being "furloughed" for that purpose.[30]

Another office normally held by a civilian but sometimes occupied by a military officer was the post of Indian agent. Normally the post commandant dealt with the Indians only in extending hospitality or comity to them.[31] Indian diplomacy was the province of the

---

[26] Dedimus Potestatem, Able vs. Archambeau, 2 December, 1801, Randolph County Circuit Court, Misc. Papers; Executive Journal, Indiana Territory, 1 September, 1801, *Ind. Hist. Soc. Pub.*, III, 104; "Coroner's Inquest over Unknown Body," 3 October, 1806; Coroner's Inquest on the Body of Stephen Brusher, 10 December, 1806, both in Randolph County Circuit Court, Misc. Papers.

[27] Thus in 1806, Lieutenant E. P. Gaines was serving as postmaster at Fort Stoddert. Postmaster General to the Chairman, House Committee on Claims, 26 March, 1806, Carter, V, 454. For such service the officer evidently received the regular compensation allowed civilian appointees. Same to same, 10 July, 1806, *ibid.*, 468.

[28] Inspector General to Bissell, 8 December, 1802, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, September, 1800 — April, 1803, 382. Bissell resigned this appointment in 1803. Bissell to Secretary of War, 18 November, 1803, War Office, Letters Received, II, 22; same to same, 6 February, 1803, *ibid.*, 16. Lt. Edmund P. Gaines, in addition to holding the postmastership at Fort Stoddert, also held the internal revenue collectorship. Gaines to the President, 4 August, 1806, Carter, V, 472.

[29] Petition of Natchez Merchants, 13 October, 1803, Carter, V, 263–264. In this case the merchants complained against Fort Adams as a port of entry.

[30] Governor Sargent to Major Thomas Cushing, 21 July, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 8–9; Cushing to Sargent, 23 July, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Sent, 14–15. The letter book of Major Cushing, Letters Sent, covers the period 14 July, 1799 — 11 March, 1800; and Letters Received the period 15 April — 2 November, 1799.

[31] For policy on this matter, see Inspector General to western commandants, 2 August, 1802, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, September, 1800–April, 1803, 320; Secretary of War to James S. Swearingen, 9 May, 1806, War Office, Military Book, III, 12. See also extract, General Alexander Hamilton to Colonel J. F. Hamtramck, 23 May, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 19–20.

Indian agent.[32] The exigencies of war and the incidents of military movement did not always permit the maintenance of a civilian agent at the military post. In such cases, the military officer logically assumed the functions of that office.[33]

Another function performed by the military commandant was that of property custodian not only for military property, but at times for the property of other governmental departments and even private citizens. This function grew in part out of the difficulties of transportation which sometimes made it necessary that the property of both government offices and private individuals be intrusted to the care of the military. Too, the death or resignation of responsible civilian officials might place their records under the temporary care of the military authority at hand.[34]

References have even been found to the post commandant's functioning as land agent, though this was not authorized. Major Doyle, and other early commandants made land grants on the military reservation at Fort Massac, allegedly as an encouragement to the development of a civilian community about the post, which would in time furnish supplies "for the Troop [sic] that might be kept there. . . ." In all, fifty-nine such grants were made.[35] In 1811 all

---

32 Major Thomas Doyle, who rebuilt Fort Massac in 1794, complained bitterly of his lack of authority to deal with the Indians. Doyle to Wayne, 11, 20 May, 1794, in Historical Society of Pennsylvania (cited hereafter as "HSP").

33 See Caldwell, "Fort Massac: The American Frontier Post, 1778–1805," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XLIII, No. 4 (Winter, 1950), 270 ff.; J. B. Varnum, Jr., to Secretary of War, 26 June, 1811, Carter, X, 362 (concerning the vacancy of the post of Indian agent at Mackinac). This last reference states that "in the meantime however the Commanding Officer at this Post, will continue to transact the business of that Department (i.e., the Indian Office). . . ."

34 Michael Jones to Secretary of Treasury, 30 April, 1805, Carter, VIII, 286–287. Thomas Dean, travelling to Fort Harrison in 1817, tells how Major John T. Chunn, commanding officer at that post, offered "to put our boat under the care of the guard at the fort, that it should not be injured or taken away." John C. Dean (Ed.), "Journal of Thomas Dean," *Ind. Hist. Soc. Pub.*, VI, No. 2, 332.

35 Petition to Congress by Inhabitants of Fort Massac, 10 January, 1805; Deposition of William Kelley, 28 January, 1805; Deposition of Richard Lord, 28 January, 1805; Deposition of John McClain, undated, all in Carter, VII, 252 ff. It seems clear that the officers making these grants did not pretend to give full titles. Quite likely these early commandants merely bowed to civilian pressure in the performance of a function that earlier colonial post commandants, whether French or British, had performed. That the civilians involved had made some sacrifice in going to an unsettled area, particularly a very unhealthful one, is evident. However, they may have overdrawn this a bit when they referred to those of their number who had been "call'd to the silent shades of death and entombed in the rubish of the wilderness . . ." as a result! One was pretty apt to get such a call most anywhere in the frontier of those days.

these claims were rejected by the Kaskaskia Land Office.[36] The following year the post commandant at Fort Massac was instructed to give no more individuals possession of lands about the fort "as such possession might hereafter be used to establish a title in the occupant."[37] A similar claim for lands near Fort Harrison, evidently originating in the same manner, was also refused.[38]

The above activities and offices enabled the commissioned officer at one time or another to increase his financial income, while at the same time the exercise of these functions added to his prestige in the civil community.[39] His retirement from the army was less a change in many cases than might be supposed, for in the army or out, the commissioned officer was already among what one writer has called the "upper crust" of the frontier community.[40]

The role of the frontier officer as a civilian office-holder may have had something to do with the spirit of independence he often showed toward superior military authority. On the surface it might seem that the post commandant stationed in the western country was more dependent on his superiors than the modern officer in command of a military installation. The army was smaller, the secretary of war could give more personal attention and direction to the various organizations and commands, and the chain of command was more direct than is the case today.[41] One is surprised that a colonel in command of a military district would ask for authority to visit the various posts under his command.[42] Again, this same officer felt obliged to communicate with distant Washington the request of a hard-pressed subordinate at Fort Madison for help against threatening Indian attacks on the eve of the War of 1812.[43] General Wilkin-

---

36 "A Statement of claims in virtue of improvements within the district of Kaskaskia, rejected by the Board," 1811, ASP, *Public Lands*, II, 120.

37 Secretary of War to Commanding Officer, Fort Massac, 21 July, 1812, War Office, Military Book, VI, 38.

38 Secretary of War to Major John T. Chunn, 13 October, 1816, Carter, VIII, 444–445.

39 Sometimes, no doubt, job-hungry civilians resented the intrusion of the army officer into the area of civilian employment. Thus in 1807 citizens near Fort Stoddert presented President Jefferson a petition against Captain E. P. Gaines who was then " 'holding three or four government positions at the same time' ". Silver, *Gaines*, 17–18.

40 See William B. Hamilton, "The Southwestern Frontier, 1795–1817: An Essay in Social History," *Journal of Southern History*, X, No. 4, 389–403.

41 Correspondence between officers in command and the secretary of war was common-place, and subalterns and even common soldiers did not hesitate to communicate with the highest authority.

42 See Lt. Col. Daniel Bissell to Secretary of War, 20 January, 1812, Carter, XIV, 508; Secretary of War to Bissell, 17 March, 1812, *ibid.*, 530.

43 Captain Horatio Stark to Bissell, 7 February, 1812, enclosure in Bissell to Secretary of War, 19 February, 1812, both in *ibid.*, 520–522.

son, commanding the army in the west, was even forbidden in 1805 to appoint a successor to a colonel deceased at New Orleans.[44]

These examples, however, do not reveal the officer, especially the post commandant, in his true light. After all, the commissioned officer at a lonely outpost was often far removed from both Washington and his immediate superiors. Frequently he was faced with the necessity of acting upon his own authority. Too, he was often the only adequate judge of his actions. Sometimes, as would seem to be the case with General Wilkinson, he may have been more clever than his superiors. Or, he might play one of his opponents off against the other.[45]

It is because of his independent spirit and not infrequent high-handed acts that the frontier officer was often brought before courts-martial or subjected to other military discipline. Sometimes he earned a nickname on this account, as witness the case of Major Thomas Doyle, who rebuilt Fort Massac in 1794, and who, because of his spirit, was called "King" Doyle. This officer dared to defy an order of General Wilkinson to permit a boat bound for New Madrid and carrying some Spaniards arrested as the accused murderers of Henry Owen, a prominent Kentuckian, to pass Fort Massac, all because the major reasoned that the accused should be tried on the soil where they had committed their crime! [46] This act so enraged Wilkinson that he placed Doyle under arrest for what he called "unwarrantable interference" in the case of the Spaniards, stemming from the major's "informity [sic] of Judgment and pride of office."[47] In preferring charges against the major, however, Wilkinson did not base his case on the affair with the Spaniards, but rather upon other allegations, which included drunkenness, disrespect for a superior, and theft of government property![48] In the end no trial

---

[44] It is true that the deceased officer, Lt. Col. Thomas Butler, was one of Wilkinson's bitterest enemies. He alone had resisted Wilkinson's famous "short hair" order of 1801. Secretary of War to Wilkinson, 21 November, 1805, Carter, XIII, 290; Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 30 December, 1805, *ibid.*, 349.

[45] Silver, *Gaines*, 8; Major Thomas Cushing to Captain B. Shamburgh, 4 September, 1799; Shamburgh to Cushing, 3 September, 1799; same to same, 20 October, 1799, in Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, n. p., and Letters Sent, n. p.

[46] For a discussion of the case, see Humphrey Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, II, Frankfort, 1824, 154–155; Reade MS., 216. Pertinent military correspondence is found in Doyle to Wayne, 28 June, 20 August, 1795; Doyle to Portell, 20 January, 1795; Portell to Doyle, 23 January, 1795, HSP.

[47] Wilkinson to Harry Innes, 24 April, 1795, Innes Papers, Library of Congress.

[48] "A true copy of the charges, exhibited against Major Thomas Doyle. —," 2 February, 1796, War Office, Letters Sent and Received, 1796, Box 7.

resulted, since Doyle was supported by General Wayne, who hated Wilkinson, and who permitted Doyle to retire honorably from the army.[49]

Another officer who defied Wilkinson successfully was Major Seth Hunt, a man who held a brevet commission as military commandant of Ste. Geneviève in Louisiana Territory. Hunt, evidently a man of volatile temperment, is said to have "evinced too much spirit to please the governor." This affair smacks of the political differences between Federalist officers such as Wilkinson and his son, Lieutenant James B. Wilkinson, on the one hand, and the followers of President Jefferson on the other. Hunt was challenged to a duel by Wilkinson's son and another officer, but refused to accept. Later Hunt and one of his friends were assaulted in their quarters by friends and relatives of the general. Hunt challenged these men, but Wilkinson forbade the duels.[50]

James McFarlane, a special Indian agent sent to the Arkansas country in 1808 to investigate illicit trade there, complained that Captain George Armistead, commandant of Arkansas Post, refused "to act further than he thinks proper, and says that he has no superior officer. . . ." When McFarlane showed the captain his instructions, the latter still refused to cooperate and remarked that even if the Louisiana Governor himself were there "he should not take this authority out of his hands."[51] Governor Holmes of Mississippi Territory complained that when one of his justices issued a civil process against certain persons in the army, the civil officer authorized to serve the precept "was resisted in the exercise of his duty, by a military officer's refusing to permit him to take out of the cantonment the persons he had arrested by virtue of the Warrant. . . ."[52]

On occasion post commandants even dared to leave their posts or to make military movements without authority. Andrew Ellicott, the Federalist agent sent to the lower Mississippi in 1797, persuaded Lieutenant Percy Smith Pope, commonly known as "Crazy Pope,"

---

[49] Doyle to Wilkinson, 23 September, 1795, Wayne MSS., Library of Congress; Doyle to Wayne, 22 November, 1795, *ibid.;* Wayne Orderly Book, IX, *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, XXXIV, 657; Wayne to Doyle, 15 April, 1795, HSP.

[50] Pertinent correspondence concerning this matter may be found in Carter, XIII, 208, ff.

[51] James McFarlane to Governor Lewis, 11 December, 1808; inclosure in Clark to Secretary of War, 29 April, 1809, both in Carter, XIV, 264–268.

[52] Governor Holmes to Colonel Thomas H. Cushing, 20 June, 1800, Carter, VI, 74–75.

to descend with his troops from Fort Massac to Natchez against the orders of General Wayne.[53] In 1811 Lt. Col. Richard Sparks organized a private expedition against the Spanish at Mobile, ordering United States troops to make certain dispositions to this end. Acquitted by a court martial, Sparks was referred to President Madison because of the "novel" nature of the case.[54].

Many examples could be cited of moral lapses on the part of frontier officers. Major Doyle says he was obliged to arrest Captain Isaac Guion, his next ranking officer in the detachment en route to the lower Ohio to reconstruct Fort Massac in 1794, because Guion "was determined to take his mistress with him contrary to my possitive [sic] order to the Contrary—."[55] In 1796 Doyle's successor at Fort Massac, Captain Zebulon Pike, placed his immediate subordinate, Lieutenant Aaron Gregg, under arrest, Gregg being charged with seducing the wife of a private soldier and keeping her as a mistress in what Pike called "a scene of Error & Iniquity. . . ."[56] Most notable for his escapades was perhaps Captain Daniel Bissell, who served as commandant at Fort Massac, 1801-1807. Bissell, married and living with his wife at the post, was indicted in 1804 for an attempt on the life of William Chribbs, a merchant at Fort Massac, with whose wife Bissell was enamored. This attempt, planned by Bissell to be executed by one of his soldiers with the connivance of Mrs. Chribbs, consisted of a plan to blow up Chribbs' house with gunpowder![57] Bissell having escaped criminal conviction, Chribbs brought a civil suit against him for debauching and seduc-

---

53 Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question*, New York and London, 1934, 60; Andrew Ellicott, *The Journal of Andrew Ellicott*, Philadelphia, 1803, 80. Lieutenant Pope died disobeying orders. Stationed at Walnut Hills above Natchez in 1799, and ill, he left that post without orders and went to Natchez where he died 12 July, 1799. Cushing to Wilkinson, 22 July, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 11–12.

54 General Orders, Baton Rouge, 27 April, 1811, in Post Revolutionary War Records, Volume 150 (cited hereafter as "Orders, Baton Rouge").

55 Doyle to Wayne, 4 June, 1794; Guion to Wayne, 5 June, 1794; Guion to Wayne, 9 July, 1794, all in HSP. Guion was turned over to the civil authorities under the charges of having rescued "a Certain woman from the hands of the Sheriffs Officers." Wayne to Doyle, 31 January, 1795, HSP.

56 Pike to Wilkinson, 3 July, 1796; Pike to Wayne, 5 July, 1796; Pike to Wayne, 6 August, 1796, all in HSP.

57 Plea in Bissell vs. Chribbs, August Term, 1806, quoting United States vs. Bissell *et al.*, 1804, Randolph County (Ill.) Circuit Court, Miscellaneous Papers. The court records indicate that neither Bissell nor Rumsay, the private soldier, were ever produced for trial. Bissell was, however, put under a "peace bond" in 1806 after a jury found him not guilty of the charge. *Ibid.*, dated (?) August, 1806; indictment with true bill and plea, United States vs. Bissell, 1804–1805, *ibid.*

ing his wife, seeking $3,000 damages.[58] Bissell countered by bringing a civil suit against Chribbs for $1,500 for damages and expenses he had been put to in defending himself against Chribbs, which defense he alleged had caused him "to undergo great labors as well in body as mind. . . ."[59] Nothing more is heard of these suits. As for Mrs. Chribbs, the French girl who caused all this turmoil, she married a third man in 1809.[60]

Other examples of moral charges against officers could be cited. In 1804 Captain Hugh McCall was tried at Fort Wilkinson "for keeping a miss." The captain's crime was considered serious, not only because he had violated orders forbidding this practice, but also because the "miss" he had chosen had formerly been kept by one of the garrison privates![61] Another officer was forced to resign his commission after a career which ended in a tavern "in some part of the State of Tennessee, under circumstances highly dishonorable to himself."[62]

The most famous disciplinary case of all, however, was the court-martial of Lt. Col. Thomas Butler, a veteran of the Revolution, who absolutely refused to comply with General Wilkinson's famous order of 29 April, 1801, that the long hair of the earlier days should be cropped on both enlisted and commissioned personnel.[63]

The frontier commandant represented his government to strangers appearing at the post. During the time of the "X.Y.Z." Affair when the western country feared French intrigues and plots, strict orders were issued to post commandants to regulate the privileges of visitors more closely. This resulted from the suspicious tour

---

58 The plea alleges that Bissell forcibly entered Chribbs' home and debauched his wife, who thereupon eloped with Bissell and lived in adultery with him for some time. Plea, Chribbs vs. Bissell, 1806; capias, Chribbs vs. Bissell, 1805, in *ibid.* The capias names the damages sought as $5,000, the plea as $3,000.

59 Plea, Bissell vs. Chribbs, August Term, 1806, *ibid.*

60 Marriage Certificate of Elizabeth Deny and Drewry Prichard, 2 February, 1809, *ibid.* Elizabeth Deny (Denis) is here described as having been "formerly the Wife of William Chribbs."

61 General Orders, 30 November, 1804, Wilkinson Order Book, 504–512 (photostat in the hands of the author).

62 Secretary of War to James Farlie, 10 April, 1807, War Office, Military Book, III, 32. In 1812 a lieutenant who stabbed his captain in Natchez was found guilty and given a reprimand. Orders, Cantonment Washington, 11 September, 1810, n. p.

63 General Orders, 29 April, 1801, Wilkinson Order Book (Library of Congress), unnumbered pages. This order book should be distinguished from the one in the National Archives cited previously. Future references to it will be designated by "LC". This order was reissued at Wilkinsonville on 29 July, 1801. Wilkinson Order Book, 344. Butler was twice tried for violation of this order and died defying it.

of the western rivers by the French agents Collot and Warren in 1796.[64] In ordinary times, however, the post commandant was only too glad to act as host to a traveller.[65] Blane, the English traveller, remarks that most tavern keepers he met in the western country were militia officers. In this case, he writes, "The landlord, although clothed from top to toe in buckskin, and not remarkably clean, was at least a captain, and generally a major or colonel."[66] The regular army officer at the frontier post, wearing the cloth coat of an officer, was perhaps the better host, for he dispensed a true hospitality and without price.

The officer's table was not to be despised, if we may believe what evidence has been found on the subject. Captain Lukens' larder offered smoked beef, bacon, and venison, with tea and coffee (with sugar) for drinking.[67] When Captain Zebulon Pike, who was stationed at Fort Massac in 1796, was promoted to the majority, he gave a dinner for the post officers at which he served "Elk, Buffeloe, Venison, and wild geece & Ducks and a plenty of White face whiskey."[68] The traveller Ashe sat down at Fort Pickering to "a very sumptious dinner . . . of fish, venison, squirrels, and bear's meat, with a profusion of wine and desert of Illinois nuts (pecans). . . ." It was one o'clock in the morning when this party broke up, though the author admits that some members of the group had "reposed under the table an hour before. . . ." As proof of his own prowess, he assures us that he was able to descend the one hundred and fifty feet of the stairway, which led down the cliff to the river where his boat was tied, without breaking his neck![69] Underwood states that the officers at Fort Massac all kept cows and

---

64 "Rules and Regulations relative to Maritime and frontier Posts or fortified places," 26 March, 1797, as quoted in Military Book, III, 151–153. See also Victor Collot, "A Journey in North America," *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society, for the Year 1908,* Springfield, 1908, 269–298; Caldwell, "Fort Massac", 276. An order by Governor St. Clair dated April, 1790, had forbidden civilians to entertain strangers unless these had first been registered with the post commandant. Carter, III, 301.

65 Only one case has been found in which a traveller was badly received, but in this case the commandant was ill. Dean, "Journal," 322.

66 Blane, 135.

67 Lukens Inventory in *loc. cit.*

68 *Journal, Thomas Taylor Underwood, March 26, 1792 to March 18, 1800,* Cincinnati, 1945, 23.

69 Thomas Ashe, *Travels in America, Performed in 1806,* London, 1808, 298. Writing in 1799 from Fort Stoddert Captain B. Shamburgh encourages the quartermaster to send him wine and brandy ordered ". . . as soon as possible, I am quite dry." Shamburgh to Cushing, 20 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 60.

hogs and had gardens. Fish was so plentiful it was used to feed hogs, while various kinds of wild game were supplied by soldier hunters.[70]

In the older settled areas such as Natchez, the commandant might give "a grand entertainment in the town," but such was not within reach of the ordinary post officer, who with less opportunity for show and display, nevertheless gave the stranger "a generous and courteous reception."[71] On the other hand, Cuming found young Zachary Taylor, then stationed at Fort Pickering, capable of offering "civility not unmixed with a small degree of the pompous stiffness of office."[72]

Here and there we get a glimpse of the post commandant as the social leader of the civilian community. Captain Lewis on his way to St. Louis in 1803 found Don Louis Lorimier, the commandant at Cape Giradeau in Louisiana Territory, settling disputes at a horse race, where the commandant's horse had lost "the main race, but won by six inches the by betts. . . ."[73] The commandant at Kaskaskia who arrived in 1805 within a short time promised to be "A most popular commandant, at least with the French Girls . . .," some of whom, our informant suspected, would soon "experience the exuberance of his affection—".[74]

Among the special military assignments held by the commissioned officer was that of "military agent." An act of 1795 had created the office of "Purveyor of Public Supplies" under the Treasury Department. In 1802 there were established three "military agents," who were to purchase and distribute military equipment and supplies. Each military post was provided with an "assistant military agent," who was chosen from the line officers of the post. This office was

---

70 *Underwood Journal,* 22, 24, 25. Hunting and fishing were also followed as sports at Massac. Ashe, 280.

71 "Mr. Ellicot and Lieutenant Pope gave a grand entertainment in the town (Natchez), to which they were kind enough to invite me. . . ." Francis Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 & 1797,* London, 1856, 349. See also Ashe, 281, referring to his reception at Fort Massac and *Bradbury's Travels,* in Reuben G. Thwaites, *Early Western Travels,* V, Cleveland, 1904, 60–61, referring to the author's visit to Fort Osage in 1810. Baily says Captain Pike received him and his party at Fort Massac "with the greatest politeness and attention . . ." and insisted on their "coming to his table during our stay at this place, which (owing to the weather) was longer than we expected." Baily, *Journal,* 252.

72 *Cuming's Tour,* in Thwaites, *Early Western Travels,* IV, 294.

73 Milo M. Qaife, (Ed.), *The Journals of Captain Meriwether Lewis and Sergeant John Ordway, Kept on the Expedition of Exploration, 1803–1806, Wisconsin Historical Collections,* XXII, Madison, 1916, 59. Lorimier held a brevet commission.

74 Elijah Backus to Jared Mansfield, 5 April, 1805, Carter, VII, 280.

continued until supplanted by the new Purchasing Department and Quartermaster's Department created by an act of 28 March, 1812.[75] In addition to military supplies the military agents handled goods destined for the Indian trade and annuities, though these were generally distributed by the Indian agent.[76] In case of the absence or incapacity of the military agent, his office was performed by the post commandant.[77] It should be noted that the military agents had nothing to do with the procurement and purveyance of food supplies, unless the civilian contractors concerned with this function failed in their duty, or in cases in which civilian contractors were not available. In such cases, the military agents were given the task of providing the rations used by the troops.[78] In extraordinary cases, the military agents purchased locally upon the best terms available, but most of their supplies were sent out from Philadelphia where a central depot was maintained.[79] The military agents were also responsible for the execution of construction projects and in connection with these activities sometimes handled considerable sums of money.[80] Sometimes the assistant military agent handled other

---

75 For a sketch of these offices, see Ganoe, *History of United States Army*, 108 and T. F. Rodenbaugh and W. L. Haskin, *The Army of the United States*, New York, 1896, 71. The term "quartermaster" is sometimes used instead of "military agent," especially in reference to larger units. General Orders, Baton Rouge, 9 March, 1811, n. p.

76 A consignment of stores and supplies destined for Fort Massac in the summer of 1805 and directed to the care of the assistant military agent there consisted of "heavy Gun Carriages and Trunks of Military Clothing & Stationary [sic], Indian Annuities, and Hospital Stores & Medicines...." A part of this consignment was sunk at the falls at Louisville. Inspector General to Secretary of War, 10 April, 1806, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, 12 February, 1805—4 September, 1809, un-numbered pages. Other goods handled by the agents were construction and carpenter's tools, hoes, spades, and tents. See Secretary of War to Amos Stoddard, 19 February, 1803, Carter, VII, 85. Forage, livestock, buildings, and other public property were also under their jurisdiction. A cargo boat going down from Pittsburgh in 1799 not only carried military stores and supplies, but had on board also two young English ladies, who were en route to West Florida to claim the estate of a deceased British officer. Deputy Quartermaster General Isaac Craig to General Wilkinson, 23 May, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 3–4.

77 See, for example, Inspector General to Secretary of War, 13 April, 1803, Inspector's Office, Letter Book, 22 February—6 December, 1803, 60; E. P. Gaines to Secretary of War, 19 January, 1807, in Carter, V, 495.

78 See, for example, General Orders, 7 July, 1805, Wilkinson Order Book, 549.

79 Secretary of War to Lieutenant William Swan, 17 March, 1809, War Office, Military Book, IV, 49. In such cases the agents were empowered to draw upon the secretary of war in payment for supplies procured, though this practice was strictly regulated. All military agents were bonded and submitted regular reports to the chief agent at Philadelphia.

80 Thus in 1809 it was estimated that the assistant military agent at Detroit would need for that year $3,000 for military construction, $1,600 for

monies such as funds for the Indian service, special expenditures for military movement, or privately for his fellow officers.[81]

The assistant military agent at the frontier post sometimes found himself in difficulties with his superiors. Balancing his accounts might be hindered by the refusal of higher authorities to honor his bills.[82] In one case, the agents concerned seem to have failed to take charge of certain public stores which were left in the care of civilians for a period of years.[83] In 1806 the assistant military agent at Fort Pickering, described as being "notorious as a gambler and tipler," was accused of having "squandered twenty thousand dollars of the public money. . . ." An investigation followed, but the accused died before it was completed![84] The decision to abolish the system of military agents was made on the ground that there was no adequate way in which the assistant agents could be held strictly responsible to their superiors, who had "no power of influence in their appointment, nor authority to call them to account for mal-practices or neglect of duty."[85]

The assistant military agent was a person of considerable importance in the civilian economy of the frontier community. Along with the military paymaster, he handled most of the money which

---

camp equipment, $300 for contingencies, and $60 for the hospital. Secretary of War to Peter Gansevoort, Jr., 31 May, 1809, Carter, X, 279. At Fort Massac, one of the smaller military installations, the assistant military agent in 1805 made single expenditures ranging in amounts from $90 to as high as $833.19. These sums were acquitted through drafts drawn on the secretary of war. Ensign Hezekiah Johnson, Jr., to Secretary of War, 2, 30 April, 31 May, 1805, War Office, Letters Received, II, 146, 147. For details on military construction, see Major Thomas Cushing to Commanding Officer, Mulberry Vale, 22 September, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 58; Captain Zebulon Pike to Cushing, 13 October, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Received, 52–53.

[81] Major T. Cushing to F. Jones, 5 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 60–61, 64; Freeman to Cushing, 28 September, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Received, 13–15; Garrison Orders, Columbian Spring, 5 January, 4 March, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, Post Revolutionary War Records, Volume 149 (cited hereafter as "Orders, Fort Adams").

[82] See Secretary of War to William Linnard, 7 August, 1806, War Office, Military Book, III, 51. In this case the secretary wants to know whether the assistant military agent at Fort Nelson "has been allowed a credit on the receipts of persons, to whom he gave due bills, which have not been paid; and also to what amount."

[83] Governor Holmes of Mississippi Territory reported in 1810 that ammunition and arms purchased at the time of the Burr Conspiracy were at this later date still intrusted to the care of private persons. Holmes to Secretary of War, 7 February, 1810; Holmes to Andrew Marschalk, 13 May, 1810, both in Carter, VI, 45, 66.

[84] Secretary of War to Captain Constant Freeman, 18 August, 1806, War Office, Military Book, III, 55.

[85] Secretary of War to W. B. Giles, 1 January, 1810, ASP, *Mil. Aff.*, I, 256. See also Secretary of War to Morgan Lewis, 8 May, 1812, War Office, Military Book, V, 377–378.

the army put into the economy of the area. He employed civilian workers and his purchases stimulated struggling business enterprises and at times, doubtless, the agricultural economy as well. At the small post, he ranked second to the post commandant and in some cases was the only other commissioned officer.

The office of paymaster general dates from 1775, but the Act of 3 March, 1799, first gave shape to a regular system of deputy and regimental paymasters. The Act of 16 March, 1802, provided for a paymaster of the army, seven paymasters, and two assistants, thus abolishing the posts of regimental and battalion paymasters; however, these were restored in the Act of 12 April, 1808. During the War of 1812 civilians were appointed as regimental paymasters. Paymasters and assistants were bonded in the performance of their duties.[86]

In general, troops in frontier posts were paid twice per year, though the exigencies of the service sometimes prevented this schedule from being carried out. Often troops received no pay for many months.[87] In the years immediately preceding the War of 1812 a fairly regular system of pay was maintained.[88] In cases in which regular pay schedules could not be maintained, authority was given to advance pay to the troops for periods of up to three months.[89] The

---

[86] Rodenbaugh and Haskin, *United States Army*, 100 ff. The officer's acceptance of a paymaster's office carried personal responsibility for the funds handled. See Captain Z. M. Pike to Cushing, 13 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 47–48.

[87] See "Abstract of pay due to the 2nd Regt. of Infantry (and) one Company & a Detachment of the 2 Regt. Arll. [sic] & Engrs. At Wilkinsonville," 2 August, 1801, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society. This roll indicates many of these troops had been irregularly paid. Writing in September, 1796, General Wayne informed Captain Zebulon Pike that no payroll for the garrison at Fort Massac had been received that year. Wayne to Pike, 2 September, 1796, HSP. See also the *Underwood Journal*, 23, 27–28. In 1799 some of the troops at Fort Stoddert had no pay for eight to ten months. Capt. B. Shamburgh to Cushing, 20 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 58. In August of that same year Captain Z. M. Pike at Fort Pickering was still looking for a pay officer who had left in May to get money for the troop's pay. Pike to Cushing, 10 August, 1799, *ibid.*, 36. This condition of delayed pay was general throughout the posts of the southern area in 1799–1800. See Cushing to Wilkinson, 14 August, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Sent, 24; same to same, 15 February, 1800, *ibid.*, 109–110. The illness of a paymaster was partly to blame for this. In March, 1805, the garrison at St. Louis had not been paid since the previous August. J. Bruff to Wilkinson, 12 March, 1805 (copy), Carter, XIII, 103.

[88] See Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 18 February, 1812, Carter, VIII, 165. In 1810 a general order in the southern district contemplated keeping the troops paid to within two months of their service time. General Orders, Southern and Western District, 24 August, 1810, in Orders, Cantonment Washington, 11 October, 1810, n. p.

[89] Secretary of War to Paymaster General, 5 May, 1812, War Office, Military Book, V, 369.

post of district paymaster was rated as a full-time military assignment.[90] The paymaster, whatever his rank, rated a military escort.[91]

In the earlier period the paymasters drew their funds directly from general headquarters.[92] After the opening of ports of entry and land offices in the western country, however, the military paymaster might secure funds from Treasury Department collectors or their deputies, or from private banks; this system was in operation at least as early as 1810.[93]

Bank notes were more commonly used in paying the troops than specie, partly because they were more convenient to transport, but also, doubtless, because they were more readily available in the frontier country.[94] One difficulty encountered in making payment was that of finding the proper denominations of paper or specie to pay each soldier the actual amount due him.[95] That the soldier

---

90 Secretary of War to Governor Harrison, 11 July, 1811, Carter, VIII, 126.

91 See Bissell to Secretary of War, 28 May, 1812, Carter, XIV, 551; General Orders, Columbian Spring, 7 March, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, n. p.

92 Thus Underwood was obliged to travel in person to Greenville and Detroit in 1796 and 1797 to secure the funds to pay the troops at Fort Massac. *Journal*, 23, 27–28.

93 John Brahan to Secretary of Treasury, 20 April, 1810, (citing Secretary of Treasury to Brahan, 21 March [?], 1810), in Carter, VI, 61. See also Secretary of Treasury to Nathaniel Ewing; same to Edmund H. Taylor, 16 July, 1810, both in Carter, VIII, 33–34; same to Ewing, 15 March, 1810; same to Taylor, same date, in *ibid.*, 10. Each transaction had to be authorized previously by the secretary of the treasury. Secretary of Treasury to Ewing, same to Taylor, 29 November, 1810, *ibid.*, 61–62; Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 2 January, 1811, *ibid.*, 71; Secretary of Treasury to Ewing, same to Taylor, 14 March, 1811, *ibid.*, 114–115; same to Ewing, same to Taylor, 21 August, 1811, both in *ibid.*, 129–130; same to Ewing, 7 December, 1811, *ibid.*, 141; Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 1 January, 1812, *ibid.*, 158; Secretary of Treasury to Ewing, same to Taylor, 5 March, 1812, *ibid.*, 169–170. Another relationship between the military paymaster and the revenue collector was that the latter sometimes intrusted his funds to the former for transit to places of deposit. See Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 2 October, 1809, Carter, VII, 674.

94 Secretary of Treasury to Edmund H. Taylor, 16 July, 1810; same to Nathaniel Ewing, same date, Carter, VIII, 33–34. See also Ewing to Secretary of the Treasury, 1 September, 1810, *ibid.*, 43. Lt. Col. Zebulon M. Pike permitted half of the pay to be delivered in bank notes to the troops at Cantonment Washington near Natchez in July, 1810. He insisted, however, that no injury be done the soldier by this policy and ordered the paymaster to cash in coin any bills presented by the troops. He also forbade discounts on notes so cashed. Regimental Orders, Cantonment Washington, 24 July, 1810, Orders, Cantonment Washington, 10–11.

95 Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 18 February, 1812, Carter, VIII, 165. As an illustration of the kinds of funds taken in by the collectors, see, among others, John Johnson to Edward Tiffin, 3 August, 1813, *ibid.*, 269. This letter, reporting an audit of the funds then in the Vincennes office, reveals that of a total of $13,722.83 on hand only forty dollars was in gold. $3,663.33 was in silver. The remainder was in notes on the Bank of Columbia, State Bank of North Carolina, Bank of Nashville, Bank

sometimes found himself in possession of bad paper is not surprising, though the period under discussion was not a period of bank failures.[96]

The military paymaster, like the military agent, was an important personage on the frontier. Through his hands passed thousands of dollars each year, money which General Wilkinson said in 1805 was "in truth the only so[urce] of cash to the Country. . . ."[97] The impact of army pay upon the civilian economy was naturally greatly enhanced in war periods when military forces were increased. One Louisiana correspondent suggested in 1815 that the government might recover some of these funds by opening new land areas for sale![98] Any adequate estimation of the actual economic effect of military pay upon the frontier community, cannot be made, but one can well imagine the effect the payroll at Wilkinsonville in 1801 had on that small community when $12,821.06 was released at one time.[99]

The Army medical service dates in some form from the Revolutionary War, but was not given a regular organization until the period of the Legion (1792–1796). Under this organization a chief surgeon was established, with a surgeon for each sub-legion and surgeon's mates for each battalion. When the artillery and engineer regiment was created in 1794, it was allowed a surgeon

---

of Frankfort (Ky.), Bank of Cincinnati, Bank of Virginia, Mechanics' Bank (Baltimore), Pittsburgh Manufacturing Company, Bank of the Potomac, and the Bank of Pennsylvania.

96 See, for example, a petition of certain Louisiana citizens, former soldiers, who had been paid "in paper of the Banks in N Orleans, which paper is *now* refused by the receiver of public monies, & they pray Congress to pass a law authorizing purchasers to re-enter their lands & have their monies already paid placed to their credit." Memorial to Congress by Citizens of the Territory (no date, 1815), *ibid.*, VI, 501 ff.; Josiah Meigs to Secretary of Treasury, 9 February, 1815, *ibid.*, 501.

97 Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 December, 1805, Carter, XIII, 298–299. In the same year, Indiana residents blamed their failures to make land payments to the fact that "The Army being moved from our quarter of the Country, all sumed [sic] together has in a manner dryed up our resources in the article of cash. . . ." Petition to Congress by Inhabitants of the Territory, 1 October, 1805, *ibid.*, VII, 307–308. See also Petition to Congress by Inhabitants of the Territory, 1 October, 1805, *ibid.*, 314.

98 "The number of troops which have been in this Territory for many months past, has been the means of throwing a considerable sum of money into circulation. . . ." Lewis Sewall to Josiah Meigs, 8 March, 1815, Carter, VI, 513–514.

99 This is the largest single payroll of which mention has been found and was exceptional because of the then heavy concentration of troops at that post. The payrolls of Lt. Ambrose Whitlock including all the pay for the upper Louisiana and lower Ohio posts in the period 1810–1812, ranged from as low as $10,000 to as high as $23,000 each six months. Ewing to Secretary of Treasury, 1 September, 1810, Carter, VIII, 43.

and four mates. After the reorganization of the army in 1796, each regiment was given one surgeon and two mates. The Act of 16 March, 1802, provided for medical officers to be posted at garrisons and posts and not with corps as previously. In 1810 an order was issued that no detachment should be sent out on movement without a medical officer and necessary supplies.[100] In 1813 a physician and surgeon general was appointed and the first regular scheme of hospitals provided.[101]

Much could be written about the prevalent unhealthiness of the frontier and even of all America in the period under consideration. European travellers were particularly impressed with the incidence of illness and the high death rate among the Americans, one of whom at least blamed this to American medicine.[102] The French scientist Volney found in 1796 fewer than twenty homes free from fevers during a journey of some seven hundred miles into the Ohio Valley.[103] General Wilkinson, traveling down the Cumberland River from Nashville in 1801, writes that for more than a hundred miles he entered no house without encountering "Disease of the Bilious and intermittent character."[104] Richard Lee Mason found the Illinois people in 1819 almost universally suffering from "Bilious fevers in all their various shapes." He says he saw more "pale and deathly-looking faces" in Illinois in two days than he had seen in Philadelphia in two months.[105] As a rule the country grew more

---

100 Secretary of War to Wade Hampton, 22 August, 1810, Carter, VI, 102.

101 Percy M. Ashborn, *A History of the Medical Department of the United States Army*, Boston and New York, 1929, 25 ff.; Rodenbaugh and Haskin, 86–87. See also Wilfred W. Black, "The Army Doctor in the Trans-Mississippi West, 1775–1860," *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XXIV, No. 2 (September, 1943), 118–128. Black gives a very superficial treatment of the subject.

102 Cf. Charles Postel (*alias* Sealsfield), *Die Vereinigte Staaten von Nordamerika*, Stuttgart und Tübigen, 1827, 185. Sealsfield writes: "Die Sterblichkeit ist in Amerika groesser, als in der alten Welt, die Lebensdauer Kuerzer ... Viel jedoch auch die aerztliche Behandlung, die die Lebenskraft des Amerikaners oft in seiner Kindheit, ertoedtet. Selten hat er in seinem dreissigsten Jahre noch seine Zaehne: Gliedeschmerzen, Rheumatismen aller Art, Auszehrungen, sind die haeusigen und gewoehnlichen Nachwehen der verkehrten aerztlichen Behandlung."

103 C. T. Volney, *View of the Climate and Soil of the United States of America*, London, 1804, 285–286.

104 Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 August, 1801, Wilkinson Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

105 *Narrative of Richard Lee Mason in the Pioneer West*, 1819 (*Heartman's Historical Series No. 6*, New York, no date), 51. A year later Timothy Flint reported that "a third part" of the people about Vincennes were confined to bed by illness, which prevailed over most of the Wabash country. *Flint's Letters From America*, in R. G. Thwaites, (Ed.), *Early Western Travels*, VI, 287–288.

unhealthy as one travelled west and south of Cincinnati.[106] Worst of all to those not acclimated to it was Lower Louisiana, the climate of which was sometimes regarded with "extreme dread."[107]

What has been said about the health of civilians in the frontier areas applies equally to the health of the troops. Volney, who visited Wayne's troops at Greenville in 1796, found some three hundred of the three hundred and seventy men at that place suffering from the fever.[108] Captain Zebulon Pike, writing from Chickasaw Bluffs in 1799, describes his men as being "very sickly."[109] Morning reports and monthly returns sometimes revealed almost fifty percent of the troops at a station as unfit for duty.[110] No statistics are available on deaths among the troops, though these must have been excessive compared with present day figures.[111] An epidemic among the troops at Wilkinsonville in 1801 killed large numbers, but no account of the exact number of deaths has been preserved.[112] A second

---

106 Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee*, 2 vols., New York, 1810, 28.

107 Judge Coburn to James Taylor, (date missing), quoted in Taylor to Secretary of State, 8 February, 1807, in Carter, XIV, 91–92. In 1807 the Territorial Legislature of Mississippi was prorogued because of the widespread sickness prevailing. Members of the Legislature to Governor Williams; Williams to Legislature, 24 December, 1807, both in Carter, V, 590–591. Amos Stoddard, however, states that tuberculosis, rheumatism, skin diseases, and kidney and bladder calculi were rarely seen in this area. *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive of Louisiana*, Philadelphia, 1812, 174–175.

108 Volney, *View of Soil*, 286. Only three of a party of twenty-five with whom Volney travelled from Cincinnati to Detroit escaped the fever. *Ibid.*

109 Pike to Commanding Officer, Loftus Heights, Mississippi, 22 July, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 34; Pike to Cushing, 10 August, 1799, *ibid.*, 36. At the same time Captain B. Shamburgh wrote from Fort Stoddert that the sick list was increasing rapidly "... & God knows where it will stop...." Shamburgh to Cushing, 31 August, 1799, *ibid.*, 39–40. Cushing, writing to Wilkinson, said that even oxen brought down the lower Mississippi could not survive. Cushing to Wilkinson, 22 July, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Sent, 10.

110 James Bruff to General Wilkinson, 29 September, 1804, enclosure in Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 2 November, 1804, Carter, XIII, 60. The monthly return of the troops at Fort Massac for September, 1794, showed 21 of 59 men sick. In 1809 Wilkinson reported, "246 men were down at one time out of about 500," at Fort Adams. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 23 July, 1809, as quoted in *The American Register*, XII, (1810), 91.

111 In 1805 Wilkinson reported only four deaths among five companies stationed on the Lower Missouri River during the period August-October. Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 August, 1805; same to same, 29 October, 1805, both in Carter, XIII, 180, 248. When Wilkinson visited the camp early in August he found over fifty men sick.

112 For an account of this epidemic, see Caldwell, "Cantonment Wilkinsonville," MID-AMERICA, XXXI, No. 1, 21 ff.

epidemic, which occurred at an encampment below New Orleans in 1809 was perhaps even more deadly.[113]

So serious was the impact of disease upon the health of the troops that military movements and operations at certain posts were geared to the seasons, and some strategic posts were actually abandoned during the summer and fall months.[114] At a critical time in 1810 when a call had been made from Fort Stoddert for reinforcements to forestall an attack by American civilians on Mobile, the secretary of war refused to send the troops when needed because of the danger to their lives.[115]

American physicians of that period were in considerable part foreigners—Irish and German barber helpers, who had come to America and put up their shingles. Most of these fellows had conveniently "lost" their credentials during the ocean passage. They had one sovereign remedy—calomel—and, according to one observer, if thirty grains didn't help, they gave sixty.[116]

---

113 The prevailing diseases in this case were said to have been diarrhoeas, dysenteries, and fevers, to which was added the scurvy and other ills. Men were said to have been able to pull their sound teeth with their fingers, while their mouths and throats were covered with ulcers. *Medical Repository for 1811*, 85, as quoted in Ashborn, *History of Medical Department*, 27. See also Report of Investigating Committee in *American Register*, VII (1810), 95–96. The committee blamed the high incidence of disease among the troops to the general and widspread illness prevailing that year, but pointed out also the low site of the encampment, the poor provisions, the want of medical and hospital care, including failure to segregate the sick, the fatigue of raw recruits who were engaged in heavy labor, the lack of protection against mosquitoes which resulted in loss of sleep, and the unsanitary conditions in the camp. Stoddard reiterates some of these points and adds intemperance to the list. *Sketches*, 171.

114 When Cuming visited Fort Adams in 1804 (?) he found the place deserted except for a subaltern and one platoon acting as guards. The garrison was at "a pleasant cantonment in the hills towards Pinckneyville, about five miles distant." Cuming, in Thwaites, IV, 329. Cuming was much impressed with the cemetery at Fort Adams. *Ibid.*, 330. Wilkinson said it was "death to the troops" to work them in swampy areas after 1st. July. Wilkinson to Governor Claiborne, 10 May, 1803, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 27–28.

115 "Did the Season of the year admit, it would be proper that a Detachment should be immediately ordered to march. But . . . It is well known that the position is unhealthy, the movement should be delayed to as late a period in the Autumn as may be deemed compatible with the object. . . ." Secretary of War to Wade Hampton, 22 August, 1810, Carter, VI, 101.

116 Postel (Sealsfield), 188. This observer says he once expressed the hope to one of his countrymen who was practising medicine in America that he would not use calomel so often. The doctor answered: "Oh, . . . diesen muessen meine Bauern wie Schweinfleisch fressen." *Ibid.*, 190. Another authority states that foreign doctors were not well received except in areas peopled by their erstwhile countrymen. Thomas Cooper, *Some Information Respecting America*, London, 1794, 63.

Whether frontier medical men were worse than their fellows eastward is a question difficult to answer. One observer certainly thought that they were. He writes:

> Persons who have not visited the Western States cannot have any idea of the general ignorance of the practioners [sic] of medicine. A young man, after an apprenticeship of a year or two in the shop of some ignorant apothecary, or at the most, after a very superficial course of study at some school or college is entitled to cure (or rather kill) all the unhappy Backwoodsmen who may apply to him for advice. . . . Indeed, to become a doctor in the Backwoods, it is only necessary to have a cabin containing fifty or one hundred dollars' worth of drugs, with a board over the door, affirming that this is Dr. M. or N's 'store.'[117]

How easy it was for a stranger to impersonate a physician is revealed by Estwick Evans, who, while travelling in the western country in 1818, frequently ministered to the sick and acquired the title "Doctor." He assures us he did not lose a patient, which fact he attributed more to his use of psychology than of medicine. He writes: "I always told the sick, that in a few days, they would be perfectly well."[118]

On the other hand, the frontier boasted physicians of another kind. The English traveller, Francis Baily, found a physician at New Madrid, who, though he lived in a "miserable tent" and traded and farmed along with his medical practice, was a man of "good education."[119] Charles Bradbury found the post surgeon at Fort Osage, not only a gentleman, but also a scholar, who had compiled a vocabulary of the Osage language.[120]

The army surgeon of the period had no military rank,[121] though he held an appointment subject to ratification by the Senate.[122] He was entitled, however, to many of the privileges and perquisites of officers. His pay, as has been shown above, was comparable to

---

117 Blane, 159–160.

118 Estwick Evans, *A Pedestrious Tour of Four Thousand Miles, Through the Western States and Territories, during the Winter and Spring of 1818* in Thwaites, VIII, 258–259.

119 Francis Baily, *Journal of a Tour in Unsettled Parts of North America in 1796 & 1797*, London, 1846, 266. The same writer tells of meeting an army surgeon at Louisville, who was "very much of the gentleman." *Ibid.*, 244.

120 *Bradbury's Travels* in Thwaites, V, 61.

121 Secretary of War to General Wade Hampton, 2 March, 1810, War Office, Military Book, IV, 290.

122 All applicants were supposed to posses "either a Degree of some College or a Certificate from some Medical Society, of their fitness for practice. . . ." In one case, at least, the Senate refused to confirm the appointment of a man who had not met the above requirements. Secretary of War to Governor Harrison, 12 February, 1811, Carter, VIII, 107–108.

that of officers, and he wore a modified officer's uniform.[123] The army surgeon was as conscious of his grade as an officer was of his rank.[124] One case has been found in which a surgeon's mate assumed command of a post upon the death of the only commissioned officer.[125] It is not clear whether any surgeon held a commission concurrently with his medical appointment, but at least one was so recommended.[126] General Wilkinson, who had studied medicine as a young man, while en route to St. Louis to assume the governorship of Louisiana Territory in 1805, acted as surgeon for some of the men, but this was a general's privilege, doubtless.[127]

The military surgeon was obliged to make semi-annual returns to the secretary of war.[128] These reports have not been often preserved in the military records, but those that survive give some valuable information on the medical art of those days.[129] Returns

---

123 For the surgeon's uniforms see Secretary of War to General Hampton, 2 March, 1810, War Office, Military Book, IV, 290. For the status of a surgeon's baggage, see Henry Skinner to Secretary of War (received 10 May, 1810), War Office, Military Book, V, 357. Surgeons were entitled to furloughs on the same grounds as officers. Lt. Col. D. Bissell to Secretary of War, 20 January, 1812, Carter, XIV, 508. The estates of deceased surgeons were settled as in the case of officers and soldiers. Nathaniel Ewing to Secretary of the Treasury, 4 June, 1810, Carter, VIII, 23, *re* the estate of Dr. Samuel McKee, deceased. Surgeons were entitled to personal servants or "waiters" as in the case of officers. See Cushing to Lieutenant A. Marschalk, 2 August, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 19; same to Captain John Wade, 26 November, 1799, *ibid.*, 89. Enlisted personnel were assigned to the surgeon as hospital assistants and were pretty much under his control in this capacity. Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 4 March, 5 May, 1811, n. p. Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 30 July, 1810, n. p. In certain cases surgeons and hospital personnel rated special privileges in respect to passes and off-post activities. Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 28 March, 1 April, 1811, n. p.

124 See the case of one Dr. Brown, who having served in the grade of surgeon during General St. Clair's campaign in 1791, felt himself "degraded" in his appointment as surgeon's mate in 1792, and resigned. Acting Governor Sargent to Secretary of War, 9 June, 1792, Carter, II, 399.

125 See J. V. Stewart to Secretary of War, 3 August, 1808, War Office, Letters Sent and Received, 1805–1811, Box 14. The writer, stationed at Fort Pickering, signed "J. V. Stewart, Surgeon's M. ComG." The surgeon was normally subject to such post duties and stations "as the Commanding Officer shall designate." Secretary of War to Dr. John M. Daniel, 28 March, 1810, War Office, Military Book, IV, 308.

126 Acting Governor Sargent to Secretary of War, 9 June, 1792, Carter, II, 399. Sargent said it would be good economy "to indulge this Deviation of common Rule . . ." especially at smaller posts.

127 Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 16 May, 1805, Carter, XIII, 127.

128 See Francis Le Baron to Secretary of War, 20 March, 1809, Carter, X, 271. Here Le Baron excuses himself for failing to file his report. He also asks for a promotion and mentions that he had been appointed "one of the Judges of the Courts for this District which I have accepted of, presuming of your approbation. . . ."

129 The semi-annual reports did little more than to name personnel on the sick list for the period, with diseases diagnosed in each case. See for example, "Report of the Sick at Fort Massac 31*st* July, 1794," HSP.

of medicine and hospital stores are more useful in studying the tools and stock-in-trade of the surgeon. Here follows a return made at Fort Massac on 1 August, 1800:

Return of Medicine and Hospital Stores
at Fort Massac, 1 August, 1800

5 lbs. allspice	14 gals. port wine
25 lbs. barley	31 gals. Sherry wine
30 lbs. coffee	14 gals. molasses
24 lbs. chocolate	11 kegs "No. 1 and No. 2" medicine assorted
20 bottles mustard	2 sets amputating instruments
3 lbs. pepper	2 sets trepanning instruments
8 lbs. raisins	1 set tooth instruments
80 lbs. rice	1 set dissecting instruments
6 lbs. loaf sugar	1 set pocket dissecting instruments
106 lbs. brown sugar	3 sets lancets (thumb)
1 gal. lime juice	1 set lancets (spring)
15 lbs. Bohea tea	Incomplete instruments
37 gals. brandy	1 set pocket (dissecting instruments?)
37 gals. vinegar	1 set tooth instruments
	1 set lancets[130]

The tragedy of medical practice in that time was found in the mistaken concepts of the causes of disease even more than in the inadequate treatments given after diseases were contracted. A common belief, for example, was that sleeping in "open air exposed either to the dews or the sun" would infallibly cause disease.[131] Another belief was that stagnant water was "drawn into the atmosphere in a state sufficient to impregnate it with foetid smells and fatal poisons."[132] Related to this belief was the one that rotting wood brought on disease. One surgeon talked of the deadly effect of "the Mass of damp and mouldering Timber" in the barracks at Bellefontaine, saying that the floors of the barracks had sunk into the ground, producing "an unwholesome Effluvia," which he blamed for "the

130 Photostat in the hands of the author. It should be noted that both molasses and vinegar were then thought to have medicinal qualities.

131 General Orders, 9 August, 1798, in General Orders, General James Wilkinson, 1797–1808, (L. C.), 127–128. See also Cushing to Commanding Officer, Loftus Heights, 1 August, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 17–18. In 1811 men were forbidden to swim during sunny hours at Baton Rouge because it was the surgeon's opinion . . . "That bathing in the heat of the day is injurious to the health of the troops. . . ." Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 11 May, 1811, n. p.

132 Ashe, 279–280. Another writer speaks of "noxious and foetid Exhalations" as coming from stagnant water. A. Saugrain to D. Bissell, 16 June, 1809, Carter, XIV, 276–279.

late Mortality" at that place.[133] Another writer advised against sending fresh troops to Fort Clark unless new quarters were provided, for, he warned, "They will take sick as fast as they arrive, if they live in such miserable huts as are at present in the Garrison."[134]

Despite these fallacies in opinion as to the causes of disease, some constructive measures were adopted by the army in the period under consideration. In 1801 the secretary of war sought the best medical opinion as to "the kinds and proportions of medicines necessary for each post."[135] General Wilkinson, despite his shady reputation in the western country, was interested in medicine and health. He attempted to enforce simple sanitary rules in the camps and cantonments.[136] Mosquito netting was beginning to be used, though the relation of mosquitoes to the summer fevers and agues had, of course, not been suspected.[137] Ashe relates how the health of Fort Massac was improved by draining the swamps to the rear of the fort and by the introduction of sanitary rules among the men. The consumption of whiskey was also limited.[138] Volney also refers to the improvement of health through the removal of stagnant water bodies near dwelling places.[139]

---

133 A. Saugrain to D. Bissell, 16 June, 1809, *loc. cit.* See also Bissell to Secretary of War, same date, *loc. cit.* Amos Stoddard, 174, referring to illness among the troops at Columbian Spring in 1807, explains that, though this post was on high ground, the troops lodged there had lately been to lower sites and had "their systems gorged with a complication of animal, vegetable, and other noxious effluvia, which predisposed them to the attacks of violent disorders."

134 Thomas Forsyth to Benjamin Howard, 6 July, 1814, inclosure in Howard to Secretary of War, 15 July, 1814, Carter, XVI, 444–447.

135 Secretary of War to Dr. Benjamin Rush, 28 April, 1801, War Office, Military Book, 1800–1803, 115–116; same to Israel Whelen, 17 February, 1802, *ibid.*, 264.

136 General Orders, 9 October, 1798, Wilkinson Order Book, 155. Occasional post or garrison orders give attention to elementary sanitary rules about the post such as the digging of latrines and their use and the use of flowing water to wash away filth. Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 10 March, 1811; Garrison Orders, Fort Dearborn (not Chicago), 8 July, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, n. p.; Garrison Orders, Columbian Spring, 17 April, 1808, *ibid.*

137 Captain Lukens had a mosquito bar about his bed at Wilkinsonville. Lukens Inventory. Latrobe has a good discussion on the mosquitoes at New Orleans in 1819. *Journal*, 232ff. Baily tells of the use of "mosquito bar," which he says the New Orleans people called "mosquito bear." *Journal*, 309.

138 Ashe, *Travels*, 279–280.

139 "I have likewise known two instances, where drying up a small pond and a mill-stream radically delivered two families from the annual visitation of autumnal fever." Volney, *View*, 289. He refers also to the improvement of soldiers' health in Corsica through such measures. *Ibid.*, 289–292. Volney, however, still had faith in the "bitters" (a concoction consisting mostly of brandy, rum, and Madeira wine) as a specific against fevers. *Ibid.*, 288–289.

The medical authorities often failed miserably to provide for the care of the troops. In 1799 medical supplies destined for the posts of the lower Mississippi were ordered deposited at Fort Massac and many weeks elapsed before these supplies were distributed, during which time many posts were completely without medical supplies.[140] Posts are found at that time without surgeons and one post had a surgeon who had no instruments![141] Transfers of clothing and other supplies gave some relief to this situation by the end of the year.[142]

The surgeons themselves were not beyond criticism. At Fort Sargent the surgeon was alleged to have turned a hospital room over to local citizens for use as a dance hall, while the request of the territorial authorities to use the room for holding a court was refused![143] Colonel John Francis Hamtramck in the same year sent out an inquiry concerning a surgeon at Fort Massac named Pendergrast, wanting to know . . . "*what induced him to sell a horse that had been lent him, & what he has done with the money. . . .*" Pendergrast was later tried for his offense, this leaving Fort Massac without a surgeon.[144] Another surgeon died accidentally, ". . . by a fall on a bottle full of Rum, which he carried in his pocket. . . ."[145]

Little has been found concerning the care of the sick. Men reported "sick" weren't always ill, since it was the custom to return raw recruits as "sick" during the first month of service so that they might receive special drill and instruction. Officers were detailed daily at some posts for drilling such soldiers.[146] Men sent to the

---

140 Cushing to Captain I. Pasteur, 15 July, 1799; Cushing to Wilkinson, 14 August, 1799; same to same, 15 February, 1800, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 3–4, 22, 112–113; Pasteur to Cushing, 12 August, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Received, 37; Captain B. Shamburgh to Cushing, 19 July, 1799, *ibid.*, 22–24.

141 Pasteur to Cushing, 12 August, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 37. Captain B. Shamburgh wrote at this time from Fort Stoddert to the effect that, though he had a surgeon at that post, there were no instruments for him to use. Should a limb have to be amputated, Shamburgh said, it would have to be chopped off with a broad-axe! Shamburgh to Cushing, 19 July, 1799, *ibid.*, 24.

142 Cushing to Dr. Carmichael, 20 November, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 84.

143 Cushing to Carmichael, 31 January, 1800, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 97–98; Cushing to Captain John Wade, same date, *ibid.*, 95–96.

144 Pasteur to Cushing, 29 November, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 68–69; same to same, 28 July, 1799, *ibid.*, 11; Cushing to Pasteur, 11 October, 1799, *ibid.*, Letters Sent, 68. The results of this trial have not been found.

145 Shamburgh to Cushing, 1 December, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 71.

146 See, among others, Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge 4, 16 March, 1811, n. p.

hospital returned their arms and equipment to the company, while their clothing and personal effects were placed in charge of the medical personnel.[147] Those able to walk treated their own sores before the orderly sergeant.[148] Persons on sick lists could be discharged only by approval of the surgeon.[149] Reviewing officers of courts-martial decisions often remitted or modified penalties imposed on sick or ailing men.[150] Men sometimes feigned illness to cover up drunkenness, this practice being frequently referred to in post records.[151] Soldiers who were disabled or unfit for service were not forced out of the army, and many doubtless remained on the rolls, even when qualified for a small pension.[152]

The medical facilities of the army were sometimes used for treating the civil population about the military post.[153] On the other hand, civilian doctors might be called upon to minister to the soldiers.[154]

The military surgeon was undoubtedly a person of considerable prestige at the frontier post and in the adjoining civilian community. Though not a commissioned officer, he stood next to him in the military hierarchy. Then, as now, the medical man doubtless was a leading figure in society.

NORMAN W. CALDWELL

Southern Illinois University

---

147 Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 28 March, 1811, n. p.

148 Company Orders, Baton Rouge, 25 March, 1811, n. p.

149 General Orders, Headquarters, Washington, D. C., 12 July, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, no date, n. p.

150 Orders, Baton Rouge, 10 March, 1811, n. p.; Orders, Cantonment Washington, 5 October, 1810, n. p.

151 See Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 18 August, 7, 18 October, 1810, n. p. The surgeon or the commandant was to examine men in such cases.

152 Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 2, 9 April, 1811, n. p. Colonel Z. M. Pike said it was not the intent of the government "to throw on the world, poor disabled without thier [sic] being in a condition to obtain thier [sic] bread." See also Cushing to Lieutenant A. Marschalk, 8 November, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 82–83.

153 "I have directed the Surgeons mate at Chicasaw Bluffs, immediately to make up and forward to you a small invoice of medicine for the relief of our unfortunate fellow citizens. . . ." Secretary of War to S. Mitchell, 12 October, 1803, War Office, Military Book, 10 November, 1800—17 November, 1803, 543. Dr. Francis Le Baron, post surgeon at Mackinac, says he had "made Use of public Medicine" in treating white civilians and Indians about that post. He charged no fees for this service. Le Baron to Secretary of War, 30 September, 1810, Carter, X, 329.

154 General Orders, 1 February, 1798, Wilkinson Order Book, 106. In such cases the physician was paid at the same rate as a military surgeon. See Secretary of War to W. W. Bibb, (no date), refusing to allow a higher bill which Bibb had submitted for such service. War Office, Military Book, III, 411.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 37, NUMBER 3 JULY 1955

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1955

VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

THE CONSUL IN A CRISIS: LOWER CALIFORNIA, 1911 . . . . . *Lowell L. Blaisdell* 131

PEDRO DE MERCADO AND MEXICAN JESUIT RECRUITS . . . . . *Ernest J. Burrus* 140

PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS AND SPANISH MISSIONARIES—1565–1700 . . . . *John Leddy Phelan* 153

TEXAS STATE AID FOR INDIGENT SOLDIERS, 1861–1865 . . . . *William Frank Zornow* 171

BOOK REVIEWS 176

NOTES AND COMMENTS 184

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS
RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, $2.00; in foreign countries, $2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA
An Historical Review
JULY 1955
VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 3

The Consul in a Crisis: Lower California, 1911

For a long time the ultimate disposition of Baja California caused friction between the United States and Mexico. The United States evaluated the Territory in terms of the mouth of the Colorado River, the fine harbors of the west coast, and the natural resources potential. Mexico appraised it similarly, watching it with protective anxiety because it was a fringe area not seized by the United States through war or purchase.

The United States just missed acquiring the peninsula on several occasions. As it was partly occupied by American soldiers during the Mexican War, it might not have been too difficult to obtain it at the close of that struggle.[1] At the time of the Gadsden Purchase, our agent worked hard for its inclusion, and might well have succeeded had not the notorious Walker raid occurred simultaneously.[2] Walker's filibustering "Republic of Lower California," at least from the Mexicans' viewpoint, illustrated the length to which Americans would go in an endeavor to obtain the peninsula.[3] Years after this affair, minor filibustering ventures were planned.[4] After the turn of the century, the possibility of acquisition diminished,

[1] H. H. Bancroft, *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft: History of the North American States and Texas,* San Francisco, 1889, XVI, 715–719; Peter Gerhard, "Baja California in the Mexican War, 1846–1848," *Pacific Historical Review,* XIV (1945), 418–424.

[2] J. Fred Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters and the Gadsden Treaty," *Hispanic American Historical Review,* V (1922), 155–180; Paul N. Garber, *The Gadsden Treaty,* Philadelphia, 1923, 91–92, 97.

[3] The best account of this and the later Walker exploits is William D. Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers,* New York, 1916, especially 34–48.

[4] Andrew F. Rolle, "Futile Filibustering in California, 1888–1890." *Pacific Historical Review,* XX (1951), 159–166.

although as recently as World War II it was possible for an anachronistic Senator to revive the question.[5]

The last distinct opportunity for annexation vanished when the peninsula was excluded from the Gadsden Treaty. As no new Santa Ana emerged in Mexico, American convenience could not thereafter be served, and another war was patently out of the question. In fact, in 1911, when the issue became critical for the last time, the Taft administration was only too anxious to maintain a virtuous policy. "Dollar Diplomacy," especially in Nicaragua, had earned Taft and his Secretary of State, Philander Knox, an unenviable reputation in international politics. Criticized abroad, they found the home front no more sympathetic, for Taft's setback in the Congressional election of 1910 had brought the Democrats and anti-imperialistic Progressives to the fore.[6]

As it chanced, the Department of State became entangled with the Mexican Foreign Office over Lower California in a perfectly innocent way.[7] Late in 1910, Knox requested Mexico to allow American army engineers to construct dikes on the southern Colorado River to protect American property owners in California's Imperial Valley from the recurring floods. Mexico granted the request unenthusiastically after the Department of State had repeatedly affirmed its lack of designs on the peninsula.[8]

To the dismay of the Washington officials, Mexico's revolution of 1910-1911 broke out at this moment. Americans had come into possession of valuable property in Baja California,[9] creating a double problem: while our government naturally indicated its intentions of protecting American lives and property, the Díaz regime became suspicious of American protectiveness in time of civil strife. To make matters much worse, the revolution in Lower

---

[5] *Congressional Record*, 77 Congress, 2 session (1942), 1624–1625, remarks by Senator Robert R. Reynolds of North Carolina, Feb. 25, 1942.

[6] For the Nicaraguan and other Central American ventures of the Taft administration and the congressional reaction thereto, see Dexter Perkins, *Hands Off, A History of the Monroe Doctrine*, Boston, 1941, 248–254.

[7] The oft-cited Magdalena Bay, Baja California dispute with Japan developed in the second half of 1911, after the episode under discussion had closed see *ibid.*, 253–254, or, for a fuller account, Thomas A. Bailey, "The Lodge Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine," *Political Science Quarterly*, XLVIII (1933), 220–239.

[8] See *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1911*, Washington, 1912, 545–561, especially U. S. message, November 26, 1910, 545–546, and U. S. message, March 2, 1911, 560.

[9] *Ibid.*, 543; Eugene K. Chamberlain, "Mexican Colonization versus American Interests in Lower California," *Pacific Historical Review*, XX (1951), 43–55, especially 44.

California took an odd turn. In contrast to the moderate Madero, the peninsular leader, Ricardo Flores Magón, was an Anarcho-Syndicalist. His project to set Mexico ablaze with the fires of social revolution dwindled into a mere spark igniting only the peninsula.[10] Many of his warriors crossed the American border to fight in Mexico. The nature of our neutrality legislation made difficult any concerted government effort to halt the steady dribble of volunteers.[11] American newspapers, noting the presence .of non-Mexican volunteers fighting in Baja California, as well as the American property-holdings therein, did not fail to titilate their readers with speculation on the imminence of a filibuster.[12] Mexico's suspicions multiplied apace.[13]

In the light of these developments, the Department of State found itself in a peculiar position. In addition to Knox,[14] it then included Huntington Wilson as Assistant Secretary of State and J. Reuben Clark, later famous for his *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine* anticipating abandonment of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. Anarcho-Syndicalists, they reasoned, obviously were not likely to display a reverence for private property. Thus, a Department of State effort to procure a minimum protection to American rights in the peninsula became a stringent necessity. Yet, the newly-aroused domestic and international public opinion precluded adoption of the crudely direct Rooseveltian technique of dispatching a war vessel to the danger zone. On the other hand, the opposite device, namely a resort to tactful persuasion, looked unpromising in view of Mexico's coolness in reference to the ticklish dikes project. It became Knox's job to provide the necessary protection while at the same time reassuring the touchy Díaz government of America's strictest neutrality on the issue of Baja California's future no less than on the issue of the Mexican revolution as a whole. Everything considered, the Secretary of State embarked upon

---

10 For one account of the revolt, see Peter Gerhard, "The Socialist Invasion of Baja California, 1911," *Pacific Historical Review*, XV (1946), 294–304.

11 An excellent analysis of the problem up to that time may be found in Roy E. Curtis, "The Law of Hostile Military Expeditions as Applied by the United States," *American Journal of International Law*, VIII (1914), 1–38, 224–256.

12 For typical examples, see news column of *Los Angeles Examiner*, February 1, 3, March 10, 1911; *Los Angeles Herald*, February 3, 1911.

13 *For. Rel., 1911*, 412–414, messages from the Mexican ambassador, March 3, 6, 1911.

14 For a general treatment of Knox's policies, see H. F. Wright, "Philander Case Knox," in Samuel F. Bemis, ed., *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, New York, 1929, IX, 303–357.

the most moderate course of action available to him: Mexico was assured of our good will, the more plausible rumors were investigated, and the noisy California press was ignored. At the same time, Knox tried to maintain the principle of protection to American interests in Mexico, and, in the case of the Colorado dikes problem, to obtain permission for uniformed American guards to protect the construction from molestation.[15] The only obvious flaw lay in Knox's characteristic lack of patience which was sure to ruffle the feelings of the sensitive Mexicans.[16] Though the State Department's moderation deserved a favorable outcome, conditions, notably a consul's mishap, caused its policy to fail.

In this setting much responsibility devolved upon the American consul in Lower California. State Department policy then operated only slightly less elaborately than it does today.[17] Normally, of course, a consul's functions were limited to commercial and passport duties. In 1911 the only State Department mission in all of northern Baja California was located at Ensenada, then the capital of a thinly populated frontier territory. Inevitably, then, the isolated consul's functions took on an additional diplomatic burden. Data sent by this official was the Department's sole information directly flowing into its own specialized channels. Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson at Mexico City was a long distance from the peninsula, and in any case had largely to depend on the Mexican Foreign Office for news. Newspaper stories were of questionable reliability. Departments of War and of Justice data were available and often useful, though received after a sometimes crucial delay in transmission. Moreover, their value was limited because of their non-diplomatic approach.[18] Thus, conditions combined to make the Ensenada consul our quasi-ambassador to Lower California.

George B. Schmucker, a young careerist from Woodrow Wilson's

---

15 *For. Rel., 1911*, 397–398, 444, 558, Knox or State Department notes, January 19, February 17, April 5, 1911. Agreement on the dikes issue finally was reached with Mexico sending her own troops as protection, and construction was completed, *Ibid.*, 564–565.

16 Knox's impatience with Latin American habits was duly observed by the Hispanophile Elihu Root: see Philip C. Jessup, *Elihu Root*, New York, 1938, 250–251.

17 New departmental divisions and closer co-ordination between field personnel and Washington were two efforts at reform inaugurated during Knox's secretaryship, Wright, *American Secretaries of State*, IX, 325–326.

18 For co-ordination of data, extra copies of information were circulated amongst the executive departments concerned. See Record Group 74, *General Records of the Department of Justice;* Record Group 98, *Records of the United States Army Commands, Department of the Army;* and Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State*, all on deposit at the National Archives, Washington, D. C.

birthplace,[19] chanced to occupy the post under discussion. At Ensenada since 1909, his previous efforts had been largely directed at trying to control the persistent problem of Chinese smuggling.[20] Schmucker had the defects of his virtues, for conscientiousness and application led him easily into worry and nervousness.

Flores Magón's fighters, a heterogeneous conglomeration of Mexicans, I. W. W.'s, and soldiers-of-fortune, enjoyed a fair degree of military success. They captured Mexicali and later Tijuana, occupied El Alamo, a mining village southeast of Ensenada, and repeatedly threatened the capital itself. They talked as hard as they fought, specializing in ill-assorted pronunciamientos such as demands for the communization of property or confused hints which it was possible to interpret as suggesting an independent or United States-oriented Baja California.[21]

Schmucker, unaware of Washington's wish to feel its way cautiously, made an overanxious start. Early in February, 1911, he telegraphed home requesting the Government to send a war vessel to Ensenada for the protection of Americans. Eager to propitiate Mexico, Knox dismissed the request as premature.[22]

Soon the harried Schmucker was buried in demands from all sides. The State Department, busily sparring with the Mexican Foreign Office regarding the rebels' aims, urgently requested his opinion. The young Consul's estimate, offered amidst general confusion, was not inaccurate.[23] Washington further ordered that he ascertain the condition of American civilian residents of the isolated mineral area of El Alamo, and see to it that American property interests were protected.[24] The latter suggestion was superfluous, as Schmucker was subjected to a constant verbal barrage by anguished property-holders and impatient California newspapers convinced of the Consul's failure to take a firm stand with the Mexican

---

19 Letters of the Schmucker family to the Department of State, June 5, August 25, 1911, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.*

20 Schmucker to State Department, April 10, 1911, *Ibid.*

21 For an analysis of the revolution's objectives, see Lowell L. Blaisdell, "Was It Revolution or Filibustering?," *Pacific Historial Review,* XXIII (1954), 147–164, especially 155–160.

22 Schmucker to State Department, February 2, 1911, and Knox's reply, February 8, 1911, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.* A later effort by Knox, directed to the Mexican government, also came to naught, Knox's telegram, April 29, 1911, *Ibid.*

23 Schmucker's messages to the State Department, March 8, 13, 1911, *Ibid.*

24 State Department to Schmucker, February 8, March 17, 1911, and Schmucker's replies, March 18, April 10, *Ibid.*

authorities.[25] Furthermore, Celso Vega, the surly governor of the territory, alternately suspected Schmucker of complicity with the revolutionists, or sought to bully him into following Vega's wishes rather than those of his own government. If the capital were attacked, Vega threatened, Schmucker would be removed forcibly from his post.[26]

In the critical circumstances, it was regrettable that the consul, lacking sufficient help, had to spend an inordinate amount of time handling the peculiar difficulties which would befall fellow-Americans. Lower California seemed to possess an irresistible lure for Americans of dubious character and weird occupations. Thus, Mexican officials strongly suspected stray individuals without plausible mission in the peninsula. Hence, Schmucker had to confer repeatedly with one alias Harry Dell, a splurging soldier-of-fortune who had been jailed after giving an unconvincing account of his reasons for "visiting" Tijuana in wartime.[27] Again, after considerable effort, the consul induced the authorities to release from custody a Mrs. Nellie Meyers, practitioner of the occult arts, who materialized in El Alamo almost simultaneously with the Magonist army; it proved difficult to convince the suspicious Vega that her visit was made not to spy or cast spells on Mexico's army, but to collect specimens of minerals indispensable for crystal gazing.[28]

Meantime, the rapidly unfolding events in the peninsula bid fair to confuse the State Department's aims beyond recognition. Early in May, Schmucker dispatched a panicky telegram:

> "Representatives of capitalists and insurrectionists here believe me in sympathy with them. American residents believe that Lower California will be [ours] and that I know it. Governor and a few loyal citizens know a portion of the truth. Acknowledge."[29]

In Washington as well, there was cause for concern. In addition to the customary diplomatic bombardment from Mexico City, a sudden outburst of senatorial oratory devoted to the California

---

[25] See, for example, letters to Schmucker, March 27, April 28, 1911, *Ibid.;* for examples of newspaper criticism, see *San Diego Union,* April 11, 13, 1911, *San Diego Evening Tribune,* May 9, 1911.

[26] Schmucker's messages, April 7, 17, 22, 1911, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.*

[27] Schmucker's telegrams of March 8, and April 11, 1911, *Ibid.*

[28] Schmucker's letter of April 7, 1911, *Ibid.*

[29] Telegram of May 7, 1911, *Ibid.*

peninsula aggravated matters.[30] In the mounting tumult, the State Department's hope of keeping its position demonstrably unambiguous and of having its consul faithfully reflect that attitude, should have stood a fair chance of success, had not the hard-pressed Schmucker suffered a mental collapse at that very moment. Thus, he dispatched a series of mystifying telegrams to Washington on May day. These messages had little visible connection with earlier communications or with one another:

> "Governor . . . and the highest loyal officials in Mexican Republic believe that American capitalists are responsible for insurrection in all Mexico."
>
> "Confidential. Leader of seceded free masons in Mexico probably pro-revolutionary."
>
> "Confidential. Church of Rome in Mexico probably bitterly pro-revolutionary. Threatened attack on Ensenada probably for effect in order to encourage military intervention. Mexican church women are not concerned."[31]

In the days following the consul's dispatches became increasingly incoherent:

> "Confidential. I am morally certain of the allegation in my recent telegrams. Action should be taken before May fifth. Loyal Citizens are trusting you and the President of the United States to save Mexico. Telegraph line cut."
>
> "Confidential. I am morally certain that head of instition mentioned in my May 1, 9 A.M. is primarily responsible for disturbances in Mexico, Portugal, Spain, France and Morocco. Capitalists in America and socialists of Europe and America undoubtedly mere tools. . . ."
>
> "Confidential. . . . In Lower California conspirators had planned to hire new force to exterminate original insurgents. Residents preparing to depart for the United States excepting the Americans and others in confidence of conspirators."[32]

In a lucid moment, the consul requested transfer to a new post. A bewildered consular official, unaware of the sad condition of the Ensenada agent, remarked: "The first part of this—'Send my successor'—is the most sensible thing he has sent recently."[33]

---

30 *Congressional Record*, 62 Congress, 1 session (1911), 447–452. The Senate debate took place on April 20, 1911.

31 Telegrams sent by Schmucker on May 1, 1911, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.*

32 Schmucker's delayed telegrams of May 2, 7, 12, 1911, *Ibid.*

33 Consular memorandum, May 23, 1911, *Ibid.*

Perhaps Schmucker's removal was under consideration. The difficulty was that with the telegraph line cut, with transportation facilities much slower than today, events moved more rapidly than Washington could act. Mexican suspicions and the State Department's confusion reached a climax in mid-May, after the Magonists captured Tijuana in a small but ferocious battle. The Magonist field commander, an enigmatic Welsh adventurer, Rhys Pryce, declared: "We move on Ensenada next."[34] Subsequently, when someone remarked in his hearing that Lower California seemed destined to fall to the United States, Pryce's reply was: "It sounds good to me."[35] And what reports on this or similar tingling pronouncements could the State Department glean from its emissary in Ensenada?

> "To comprehend political and social conditions at the present moment, study and apply latter part of the Book of Revelation, Holy Bible."
>
> "I have a plan that will result in bettering civilization everywhere and in preventing my own assassination. Answer."[36]

Poor Schmucker was relieved of his post by an acting consul and two American physicians at Ensenada. His career was in ruins. He spent several weeks at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington regaining his mental balance. His aged father, dependent on the ex-consul financially, died of shock at the news of his son's collapse. In 1917, when Schmucker appealed for reinstatement in the Consular Service, the Department of State recalled his unhappy experience of 1911 well enough for Secretary of State Lansing to reject the plea immediately as not conducive to the "... best interests of the foreign service at this time."[37]

Schmucker's collapse, while sad enough, had ramifications other than those affecting his diplomatic career. At the worst stage of his breakdown, the Consul developed a persecution complex. He became neurotically suspicious of his own countrymen, and reported to Governor Vega that several civilians at El Alamo were collabora-

---

[34] *Los Angeles Herald,* May 10, 1911; *Los Angeles Examiner,* May 11, 1911.

[35] *San Diego Union,* May 14, 1911.

[36] Schmucker's telegrams, May 26, 1911, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.*

[37] Summary of information contained in the consular files, chiefly letters from Schmucker dated 1911 and 1917, and a letter from Lansing to Schmucker, February 8, 1917, *Ibid.*

tors of the rebels. In no small part due to this, four innocent men, three of them Americans, were wantonly murdered at the mining village, June 11, 1911.[38]

Nor was this all. While the State Department repeatedly assured the Mexican Foreign Office that no American interests were backing the rebels,[39] the Consul, on the verge of insanity, kept telling the Mexican officials at Ensenada exactly the opposite. Schmucker helped Colonel Vega prepare the contents of an important letter to the Mexican Foreign Office accusing American and British land companies in Baja California of complicity with the revolutionists.[40]

To Washington's relief the confused Magonist movement collapsed in June amidst scenes of abortive, albeit comic, filibusterism, disintegration, and military defeat.[41] However, the ill-feeling engendered in the peninsula by the revived suspicion of American filibustering schemes did not subside until years later.[42] The baselessness of the suspicions was indeed small consolation to Washington.

Though not in any sense an anticipation of the later Good Neighbor formula, policy in the Lower California crisis in 1911 represented a departure from the Taft administration's standard Latin American policy. The State Department's desire to better its reputation had much to do with the Secretary of State's procedure. The outcome of the experiment in diplomatic forebearance was not such as to encourage the paternalistic Knox to repeat the attempt. Schmucker's misfortune, added to other unforeseeable events, brought failure to a policy which a kinder fate might have made a minor but important success.

LOWELL L. BLAISDELL

Arkansas Polytechnic College

---

38 Report of Consul General at Large Murphy to the State Department, November 4, 1911, explaining the causes of the recent untoward events, *Ibid.;* also, Lowell L. Blaisdell, "Death at El Alamo," to be published September, 1955, in *Branding Iron* (Los Angeles).

39 For direct evidence of American non-involvement, see *Revolutions in Cuba and Mexico* (62 Congress, 2 session, Washington, 1913), 232, 377, 381–383, a report of a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

40 Rómulo Velasco Ceballos, *¿ Se apoderá Estados Unidos de Baja California?,* Mexico, 1920, 168–171. Schmucker hinted at his opinion in a message to the State Department, April 27, Record Group 59, *General Records of the Department of State.*

41 For the most complete newspaper accounts, *San Diego Union,* throughout June, 1911.

42 For an illustration of the virulence of Mexican sentiment, see Velasco Ceballos, *passim.*

Pedro de Mercado and Mexican Jesuit Recruits

In 1571 Philip II of Spain asked the Jesuit General, St. Francis Borgia, for members of the Society of Jesus to work among the Spaniards and Indians of Mexico, as they were doing in Florida and Peru. By September 9 of the following year fifteen Jesuits—eight priests, three Jesuit students not yet ordained, and four lay brothers—had arrived at Vera Cruz, the harbor of New Spain. Among these founders of the first permanent Jesuit Province of North America was a young student of theology, Pedro de Mercado, the only American in the expedition.[1] He was destined to play an important part in winning the good will of his fellow Mexicans toward the Order, in founding several of the first Jesuit educational centers in New Spain, and in building that venerable institution of Mexico City, the Casa Profesa and its church. While every historian of the Mexican Jesuits mentions Mercado, little investigation has been made of his contribution and the contribution of other natives of the New World to the establishment and consolidation of the Mexican Province of the Jesuits during the years of his religious and educational apostolate from 1572 to 1619.

Manpower for schools, colleges, churches and missions was ever a problem in the colonies. From the very entrance of the Franciscans and Dominicans into Mexico there was question of the recruitment of natives for the religious and secular clergy. Whether creoles should be received into religious Orders was not so much debated

---

1 Juan Sánchez Baquero, S.J., *Fundación de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, edited by F. Ayuso, S.J., Mexico City, 1945, 22. Sánchez Baquero or Vaquero, was in the first expedition of Jesuits to New Spain. Ayuso has a sketch of Mercado's life, pp. 172–173; the year indicated there for Mercado's entrance into the Society of Jesus, 1574, is a mis-print for 1566. Though he was the first Mexican recruit Mercado was not the first native born American Jesuit; this honor belongs to a member of the Brazilian Province, founded in 1549. This Brazilian Jesuit has been the subject of an article by Serafim Leite, S.J., "Cipriano do Brasil, Primeiro Jesuíta, filho da América," in *Verbum*, (Rio de Janeiro), tomo 9, (December, 1952), 469–476. Father Leite has prepared another article for the same review on the first native American priest, "Diogo Fernandes, Primeiro Padre da Companhia de Jesus, nascido no Brasil." Fernandes was born in 1543 in Porto Seguro of Portuguese parents; he entered the Order in 1560 and was ordained in 1572. In this same article we find that the second American to become a Jesuit was Jerónimo Cotta, born in Guatemala in 1545; he entered in 1561, was ordained in April, 1573, at Coimbra, Portugal, and became a member of the Province of Brasil.

as the question of vocations of mestizos and Indians. The purpose of the present article is to study the contemporary documents relating to the life of Father Pedro de Mercado to see what light they can throw upon the problem of early native vocations to the Jesuit Order. This study attempts to offer as complete statistics as possible on Mexican Jesuit recruits; it does not deal directly with legislation regarding admissions, whether general, ecclesiastical, or that of the individual religious Orders.[2]

Pedro de Mercado was born in Mexico City in 1546.[3] His parents were wealthy and prominent either as first settlers or as descendants of the first conquistadores. Pedro was sent to Spain for his education. After sufficient preparation he attended first the University of Salamanca and then that of Alacalá, from which he was graduated in 1566. It was while visiting with an uncle in Seville in the Spring of that year, that he determined to become a Jesuit.

He applied to the Provincial of the Andalusian Province, Father Diego de Avellaneda, who was later to come to Mexico as official Visitor of the Province and to receive Mercado's solemn religious profession. Mercado was received into the Order in Seville on May 14, 1566, and two years later he pronounced his first vows in Cádiz. At the end of his novitiate training, he taught the classics for two years and then immediately began his four years of theology, inasmuch as he had completed three years of philosophy in Salamanca and Alcalá before entrance into the Order. Before the termination, however, of his theological studies, he was chosen by St. Francis Borgia to form part of the first expedition to Mexico. An unusual task had been assigned to this contingent of fifteen

---

[2] References to such legislation can be found in J. Specker, S.M.B., "Der einheimische Klerus in Spanisch-Amerika im 16. Jahrhundert," in the miscellany, *Der einheimsche Klerus in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Schöneck-Beckenried, 1950, 73–97. The same author has taken up the subject more briefly in *Die Missionsmethode in Spanisch-Amerika im 16. Jahrhundert*, Schöneck-Beckenreid, 1953, 190–194. The earliest instruction on the subject for the Mexican Province is that given by the General to the Provincial, Pedro Sánchez; this document has been published by F. Zubillaga, S.J., *Instrucción de S. Francisco de Borja al primer provincial de Nueva España* in *Studia Missionalia*, vol. III, Rome, 1947, 163. The pertinent passage reads "... aunque tenga (i.e. el dicho Provincial) facultad de admitir gente a la Compañía, sea muy retenido y circunspecto en admitir la que naciera en aquellas partes, aunque sea de Christianos viejos; y mucho más si fuese de gentiles o mestizos." The principle set down is for prudence in regard to admitting not for the utter exclusion of creoles, mestizos or Indians.

[3] *Mex. 4*, f. 11v. Such references without further qualification are to the Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu at the Jesuit headquarters in Rome. The section is given first, then the number of the codex, and finally the folio.

Jesuits; they had been commissioned to found and organize not a foreign mission but a Province the very day they landed in New Spain.

Borgia's decision to send the only Mexican Jesuit at the time in Spain, now in the second year of theology, to help found a new Province was a logical one and, as events were to prove, a wise one. The contingent would not come unknown to an unknown land. Mercado's family would help establish important contacts; his own knowledge of the ways and attitude of his countrymen would prove invaluable. After a despairingly long wait, they set sail on June 13, 1572, from Sanlúcar de Barrameda at the mouth of the Guadalquivir. Just a little less than three months later they reached the Mexican mainland, and then continued overland to the capital via Perote and Puebla.

"Hermano" Mercado, as he was designated until he became Padre at his ordination, attended the theology classes at the house of the Dominican Fathers in Mexico City.[4] During his spare moments he helped to obtain and put in order the first Jesuit house in the Capital. On October 24, 1573, Mercado made his religious profession of three vows in the provincial Jesuit Church in that city; the Provincial, Father Pedro Sánchez, had been deputed by the General to receive Mercado's profession.[5] Nor had he long to wait for ordination to the priesthood. The See of Mexico City had been vacant since shortly before the arrival of the Jesuits, due to the death of Fray Alonso de Montúfar, O.P., second Archbishop. Bishop Antonio Morales, who had recently ordained Juan de Curiel, the first Jesuit of the Mexican Province to be raised to the priesthood, in his cathedral of Pátzcuaro, passed through Mexico City later in that same year of 1573 on his way to his new See of Puebla

---

[4] Sánchez Baquero, *Fundación*, 51, does not specify Mercado, but merely speaks of "dos de los hermanos estudiantes teólogos." These two were Mercado and himself, inasmuch as of the third scholastic, Juan de Curiel, it is always stated that he had finished his studies; so, *ibid.*, 22, "acabados sus estudios."

[5] Zubillaga, *Instrucción*, 163, "Podrá (i. e. el dicho Provincial) admitir a la professión de tres votos los Hermanos que lleva consigno, para que puedan ordenarse." From May 26, 1567 to February 28, 1578, by order of Pope Pius V, Jesuits had to make their religious profession before being ordained; A. Astráin, S.J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la asistencia de España*, Madrid, 1905, I, 321–325. Evidently, the privilege accorded anew by Pope Gregory XIII on February 28, 1573, of allowing Jesuits to be ordained before their religious profession had not reached Mexico by October 24th of that year, the day Mercado made his profession; the original formula signed by Mercado is preserved in *Hisp. l*, f. 279a–280.

and acceded to the request to ordain Pedro de Mercado and Juan Sánchez Baquero.[6]

Through the generous assistance of Alonso de Villaseca, the Mexico City foundation was for the time assured.[7] More important, however, than the physical plant of churches and schools, which in the beginning were not merely poor but almost primitive, was the recruitment of sufficient candidates into the Order from the first years. Only thus could the future of the Mexican Province of Jesuits be assured; it was now accepted as a part of the way of life of the New World. At the very time that utter failure had blighted the Jesuit venture in Florida, two lay brothers, Juan Salcedo and Pedro Ruiz de Salvatierra, had entered the Order in Havana in 1568 and 1570 respectively and had come on to Mexico City to pronounce their vows in 1572.[8] The following year, three priests, five scholastic students and five lay brothers were received into the Society in Mexico City.[9]

Mercado was to be summoned back to the Capital when the opportune moment arrived for extending the means of ministry there, but first he with Father Juan Sánchez Baquero had to assure the permanence of the Jesuit foundation in Pátzcuaro, Michoacán.[10] Here the two priests preached and opened schools for both Spaniards and Tarascan Indians. As plans were being discussed for the

---

6 Sánchez Baquero, 65. A. Pérez de Rivas, who came to know Mercado about 1602, gives a far more complete account of his ordination in his *Corónica y historia de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, bk. I, ch. 19. Quoted in this article is the Library of Congress manuscript, for a study of which see J. V. Jacobsen, "The Chronicle of Pérez de Ribas," MID-AMERICA, IX, 81–95. The greater part of the *Corónica* was published, but unfortunately from a less complete manuscript; it appeared in Mexico City in two volumes in 1896. Whenever possible, the printed edition will be cited.

7 Astráin, III, 124 sq.

8 For the Florida venture, see *Monumenta Antiquae Floridae*, edited by F. Zubillaga, S.J., Rome, 1946. The Mexican catalogues, *Mex. 4*, f. 4–4v, furnish this information about both lay brothers; the 1573 report sent to Rome, *Hist. Soc. 41*, f. 243–243v, does not list Ruiz in the Mexican Province; that of 1576 does; *Mex. 4*, f. 4. If he really pronounced his vows in Mexico City in 1572, he must have returned to Havana before the 1573 catalogue was compiled.

9 *Mex. 4*, ff. 3–5.

10 The greater part of the account of Mercado is based on letters of the Jesuit Generals Mercurian and Acquaviva to Mercado and other Jesuits in Mexico; of these messages twenty are addressed to Mercado. His own letters do not seem to have been preserved; those of the Generals are contemporary copies found in two volumes designated *Mex. 1* and *Mex. 2*. Another helpful source has been a lengthy report of one who accompanied Mercado in some of his apostolic expeditions, Brother Juan de la Carrera. The original of his *Relación* is preserved in *Mex. 16*, ff. 179–187.

transference of Pátzcuaro to Valladolid (the present Morelia), no special effort was made at this time to enlarge the schools.[11]

From Pátzcuaro Mercado went to Oaxaca to help consolidate the small beginning made there. Misunderstanding any envy had plagued that difficult mission from the start. His own health gave way under the strain of the arduous work and unpleasant conflict and, in a moment of dispondency, he begged the Jesuit General to be allowed to return to Spain, where he had spent so many happy years as a student. When it was decided to go ahead with the consolidation of the Pátzcuaro foundation, Mercado was summoned back to that city. The General wrote him on March 24, 1584, to acknowledge his favorable report of the good accomplished there.

Before the end of 1585 he returned to Mexico City to help out for a short period with the ministry in the Jesuit church there. The next scene of his apostolate is Zacatecas, which opened the route to the Jesuits' effort of nearly two centuries to bring the wild tribes of the north and especially northwest into the pale of civilization and of the faith. Here, again, we find Mercado in the vanguard. His work took him among the neglected Indians. To establish an effective center of Jesuit ministry in Zacatecas, Mercado had endeavored to build a residence and a church, with the hope that a school here as in all other cities of New Spain would follow. Information, however, sent to Rome had counselled delay in such efforts in order wisely to prevent over-extension of available manpower.

Even before this decision had been made known to him, he had returned to Mexico City, where he pronounced on January 19, 1592, in the Jesuit College Church and in the presence of Father Diego de Avellaneda the four solemn vows of a Professed.[12] When the favorable turn of events that same year made it possible to extend Jesuit ministry in the city of Oaxaca and the nearby Indian mission with its school, he hastened back to that important center. During all these years he had been sending numerous pleas to Rome for more workers, and had been insisting that more attention be given to Indian ministry.

By 1594, at the latest, Mercado was back in Mexico City, this time at the Casa Profesa, where he was to spend the twenty-five remaining years of his life. Here his principal work was to build a

[11] The first Jesuit Provincial Congregation, held in 1577, reported that there were fifty pupils in the Pátzcuaro establishment; *Congr. 42*, 305.

[12] The autographed formula is preserved in *Hisp. 2*, f. 381–381v.

worthy center of Jesuit ministry in the Capital of New Spain—the church and residence of the Profesa. They were erected on the very site where once stood the house in which Mercado had been born.[13] Almost certainly the property was given to the Order by his parents, if they were still living, or by close relatives. Hernán Múñoz de Obregón, a relative of Mercado, left the first sum of money for the building of this new center. Two prominent citizens, Juan Luis de Rivera, royal treasurer and city alderman, and his wife, now came forward to become its generous founders.

Mercado devoted all his time and attention to the construction of the church and later of the residence. With the help especially of the devoted Indians, he brought stone, timber and other building supplies from the mountains. When funds ran low, he turned tireless beggar. At the end of June of 1610, word reached Mexico City of the recent beatification of the founder of the Jesuits. It was decided to celebrate that same year this event along with the dedication of the church, on the feast of the new Blessed, Ignatius Loyola, July 31. But Mercado's work was not to end with the dedication of the church; he continued to improve and beautify it, and to work on the erection of the residence to the eve of his death, October 15, 1619.

This is in brief outline the story of the building of the Profesa as found in the numerous contemporary documents still extant. But to judge from the replies of the Jesuit Generals' letters, the main theme of Mercado's messages was the importance of not neglecting the Indian ministry. Each General in answering kept assuring Mercado that he should insist that special attention be given to this apostolate when writing the Visitor, Provincial, and other superiors in a position to further it effectively. The emphasis given at this time by the Mexican Province to this minstry owes much to Mercado's tireless insistence.

Such ministry among the Indians was two-fold: in the cities, and in the distant missions on the northern frontier, or to use the terminology of the time, among the Christian Indians and among the infidel or pagan Indians. Let us see what was accomplished among the two groups during the life-time of Mercado; we shall not try

---

[13] Pérez de Rivas, *Corónica;* nearly the entire "Libro quinto" deals with the Casa Profesa; he comes to speak of it again when he gives an account of the life of Mercado in ch. 19th of the same "Libro." The present beautiful Church of the Profesa was not erected by Mercado, but goes back only to 1720; G. Decorme, S.J., *La obra de los Jesuítas mexicanos durante la época colonial,* Mexico City, 1941, I, 113.

to list the countless missions preached throughout the land, but rather see what centers of apostolate were established.

The first church which the Jesuits opened upon their arrival in Mexico City was known as the *Jacalteopán* or adobe hut church, built for them by the Indian chieftain, Cortés of the town of Tacubaya.[14] We have already mentioned the Indian ministry of Pátzcuaro in Michoacán to the west, Oaxaca to the south, and of Zacatecas to the north. In Valladolid in Michoacán, the Jesuits conducted an Indian school and opened a language school for diocesan priests destined to work among the Tarascans. A more important language school opened for Jesuits in 1579 at the urging of the Viceroy Enríquez in Huitzquiluca, near Mexico City; at the same time sacred ministry was carried on among the Otomí Indians of this area. However, before a year had gone by, the Jesuits transferred their language school to what was to become the most important civilized Indian center of the Jesuit Mexican Province and shortly later its main Novitiate, Tepotzotlán, likewise near Mexico City.[15] In 1581 the Philippines with a large native population was added to the growing list of areas to be taken care of by the Mexican Province.

Already the first Jesuit Provincial Congregation held in Mexico City in 1577 had recommended the establishment of special chapels and schools for the Indians.[16] Thus, Tepotzotlán soon had its San Martín School; Puebla, its San Miguel; and Mexico City, its San Gregorio. The story of these Indian centers and their long and fruitful ministry may be found in any history of the Mexican Jesuits. What is not so well known is the insistence of the first Jesuit Provincial Congregation that native Indians be ordained in order to help with the ministry among their own people.[17]

As we have seen, it was not merely in the cities and larger towns that the Mexican Jesuits devoted themselves to sacred ministry among the Indians. In the boundless regions of the north slowly opening up to the advancing Spaniards, they began to establish a chain of missions that would culminate nearly two centuries later in the spiritual conquest of Lower California and southern Arizona. During Mercado's lifetime, such important mission centers were

---

14 *Ibid.*, I, 6. Francisco Florentia, *Historia de la Provincia de Nueva España*, Mexico City, 1694, 132, says that he was the Cacique of Tacuba.

15 Sánchez Baquero, 151; the "Esquiluca" there is for Huitzquiluca.

16 *Congr. 42*, f. 309v–310v.

17 *Ibid.*, f. 309v–310. The Fathers congregated insisted that Indians, given the proper intellectual and moral formation, "no ay que dubdar sino que se podrían ordenar y ser muy aptos ministros... y haría uno dellos más que ciento de nosotros."

established as San Luis de la Paz (1589) and Parras (1598); the first entry into Sinaloa goes back to 1591, that among the Tepehuanes so fruitful in martyrs was made in 1596, and that among the Acaxees and Xiximíes already in 1592. Southern or lower Tarahumara became mission territory in 1607.

Ministry among the Spaniards and mestizos grew even more rapidly, for the need was no less pressing. Further, it was wisely realized that schools must be established for the education of youth not only to develop an educated laity and be a source of capable candidates, but also to have bases of operation from which to carry on the mission work. In 1619, the year of Mercado's death, the Mexican Province had established churches (with adjoining residences) and schools in the following cities: Mexico City (three schools and one church), Puebla (two schools and one church), Oaxaca, Guadalajara, Valladolid (Morelia), Pátzcuaro, Tepotzotlán (Novitiate and Indian school), Guatemala, Guadiana (Durango), Sinaloa; churches with adjoining residence but no school in Veracruz and San Luis de la Paz; missions in Parras, Topia, San Andrés and among the Tepehuanes, as detailed more fully above. The mission in the Philippines had been established from Mexico and developed into an independent Province, although Jesuits born in Mexico continued to work there.

Let us now study the growth of the Jesuit Mexican Province as evidenced by the increase in native vocations. We call native vocations those whose birthplace was the territory ministered to by the Mexican Province, that is, almost co-terminous with the regions called New Spain. Accordingly, Santo Domingo, Cuba and Guatemala are listed under Mexico. The early catalogues (1571, 1573, 1576 and 1580) do not indicate the birthplace of the members of the Province, but rather the place where they entered the Order. Subsequent catalogues do not give the place of entrance but, with few exceptions, the birthplace of the candidates or members of the Order. The comparatively rare exceptions are almost exclusively of those making up an expedition on its way from Europe at the time of the compilation of the catalogues. I have tried by consulting numerous other contemporary documents and especially subsequent catalogues to fill in the lacunae; thus, it has been possible to establish the native country of all except eight. It is well nigh impossible, except in a few rare cases, to determine the racial origin of the candidates; such data even when found has been omitted from the present study.

The number of native vocations rose from one in 1572, when Mercado came to Mexico, to one hundred and twenty-one in 1619, the year of his death. For these years we have the official record of two hundred and thirty-five native born Mexicans who joined the Jesuits in New Spain. The statistics of other countries are given by way of comparison. It may be of interest to learn about the numerous countries from which men came to join the Mexican Jesuits as this early date, a fact which to date has remained unnoticed. Within the relatively brief period we are studying, there worked in Mexico according to the extant catalogues, thirty-seven from Italy, seventeen from Portugal, seven from France, five from the Low Countries, two from the Nuevo Reino de Granada (Colombia), two from Denmark, and one each from England, Ireland, island of Chios, Portuguese Africa, Germany and the Philippines.[18] The numerous Jesuits who worked in Mexico enroute to the Philippines are not considered in this study.

The 1571 catalogue is an unsigned list of fourteen Jesuits who had been chosen in that year by St. Francis Borgia to set out for Mexico.[19] Mercado's name is not on this early list. The official catalogue drawn up of the entire Society of Jesus for 1574 contains a list of sixteen Jesuits working in Mexico; but it really goes back to February of 1573, when it was compiled and sent to Rome but not incorporated until the following year.[20]

According to the first detailed extant catalogue of the Mexican Province, that of 1576, five priests, five scholastics and twelve lay brothers had joined the Jesuits since their arrival in New Spain.[21]

---

[18] *Mex. 4*, ff. 1–260v; the catalogues and reports found here are the main source for the rest of this study.

[19] *Mex. 4*, f. 1.

[20] *Hist. Soc. 41*, f. 243–243v; the account of Mercado is entered on this latter folio, "Hermano Pedro de Mercado, de 28 años, seis años de Compañía, scholar, dos cursos de theología, estudiante, es ábil, aunque achacoso de salud. . . ." Of the fifteen Jesuits who had come to Mexico in 1572, Father Francisco Bazán had died before the year was out (Juan Sánchez, *Fundación* 46–47), and Father Juan Rogel had returned to Havana. The three new comers according to the 1573 list are: Father Antonio Sedeño of Florida fame, and the two lay brothers, Martín González and Juan Salcedo, the latter received, as we have seen, in Havana.

[21] Of these the most eminent was Father Juan Tobar, apostle of the Indians and writer in their language, to whom the Spanish Jesuit José de Acosta was deeply indebted for his knowledge of Mexican antiquities. Much has been written about the incompetency of Father Bartolomé Saldaña, one of the five priests who entered at this time (Juan Sánchez, *Fundación* 58); what Sánchez there states is certainly correct, but Father F. J. Alegre, S.J., in his *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, vol. I, Mexico City, 1841, 72–73, 153, in taking over the account from Sánchez, went a step further and concluded first that Saldaña's ineptitude

This does not include the two lay brothers who, as has been pointed out, joined the Order in Havana. In addition, two non-Spaniards had joined the Mexican Province. The first was Fernão Gomes, born in Arzila in Africa in 1542 of Portuguese parents at a time when the city was still a Portuguese possession.[22] Gomes entered the Jesuit Mexican Province already a priest on October 23, 1574. He became most proficient in several Indian languages and wrote an Otomí grammar. The second was the Italian Father Vincenzo Lenoce (often Hispanisized to Vicente Lanochi), who had entered the order in Messina and had come in 1574 to Mexico, but returned to Europe in 1579.

In 1579 a list was drawn up of fifteen Spanish Jesuits who made up the expedition that set out on May 29th of that year for Mexico. The 1580 catalogue shows that of the 101 members who constituted the Province of Mexico, fifty-one entered the Order in Mexico, forty-three in Spain, three in Italy, and three in Havana.

Beginning with the 1585 catalogue, all will henceforth indicate the native land of the entrants rather than the place of entrance. Naturally very many entering the Order in Mexico had been born in Spain; from available documents there is no way of learning when they came to Mexico, except in an extremely few instances. Out of the 144 Jesuits in Mexico in 1585, thirty-seven were born in New Spain, four in Italy, one in Portuguese Africa, and the remaining 102 in Spain.

By 1592, the total number had risen to 216; of these sixty-one were born in New Spain, eight in Italy, three in Portugal, one in Portuguese Africa, and one in Peru; the native country of three can not be determined with certainty. The remaining 139 were native Spaniards.[23] A contingent of thirty-eight left Sanlúcar de Barrameda on July 20, 1594, in order to come to the assistance of the rapidly expanding Mexican Province and Vice-Province of the

---

was due to the low standards of formation for the clergy in Mexico, and secondly that this was typical of the time. Alegre was unaware that Saldaña received his seminary education in Spain and was ordained there, not in Mexico; *Mex. 4*, f. 4v.

[22] *Mex. 4*, ff. 3v, 149. As Arzila did not pass out of the hands of the Portuguese until May 11, 1550, it follows that at the time of his birth, Gomes was a Portuguese subject; Fortunato de Almeida, *História de Portugal*, tomo II, Coimbra, 1923, 340. But since the city of Arzila was no longer in Portuguese possession at the time of his entrance, I did not include him among the forty-six Portuguese Jesuits who worked in the Mexican Province during the colonial period, "Jesuítas portugueses na Nova Espanha" in *Brotéria*, vol. 47 (Lisbon, 1953), 547–564.

[23] *Mex 4*, ff. 46–58.

Philippines, which now had forty members. This large influx raised the number of Spaniards in the Mexican Province to 162 in 1595, according to the catalogue of that year. The number of native Mexicans is sixty-two, not counting the five who have set sail for the Philippines. There are in New Spain alone ten from Italy, four from Portugal and one each from Portuguese Africa, France, Denmark and Belgium (Ghent).[24]

The 1600 catalogue shows a considerable rise in the number of native Jesuits; they now number seventy-four in New Spain and five in the Philippines, out of a total of 267 and forty-seven respectively. There are 175 native Spaniards, a relatively small increase since the last catalogue. There are six native Portuguese working in the Province and as many Italians; there is one each from Belgium, the Philippines, Peru, Portuguese Africa, France, and Denmark.[25]

In 1604 there were 290 Jesuits in New Spain and forty-six in the Philippines, of whom eighty-four in the first and five in the second were born in New Spain. Of the remaining Jesuits working in the Mexican Province, 185 were Spaniards, nine were Italians, seven were Portuguese, and one each was from Portuguese Africa, Belgium, France, Germany and Denmark.[26]

The 1607 catalogue shows a sharp decline in the personnel of the Mexican Province.[27] There were at that time only 265 in all, twenty-five fewer than in 1604. Of the total number, 169 are native Spaniards, sixty-six are born in Mexico. Of the rather large number whose native country is not indicated in this catalogue, it has been possible to determine such with the help of subsequent catalogues and other documents, except for three whose names do not appear elsewhere. Of the remaining twenty-seven, Italy is the home country of twelve, Portugal of nine, France of two; one

---

[24] *Ibid.*, ff. 68–83v; the list of those making up the expedition is found in ff. 63–64v.

[25] *Ibid.*, ff. 105–128; in the "Catálogo de los 23 subgetos que llevó a Mexico el Padre Pedro Díaz en la flota de el año de 1599 que salió de Cádiz a 18 junio," (*ibid.*, ff. 103–104v), there is one Portuguese lay brother, and "Hermano Martín, Chino," of whom we have spoken in note 18.

[26] *Ibid.*, ff. 143–165v; the German brother, Joannes Martínez (f. 155v, for Martin?), was born in Hamburg, and entered the Jesuit Order in Mexico in 1602. He is the first German Jesuit that I find recorded in the Americas; cf. A. Huonder, S.J., *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionäre des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg, 1899, 11, "... der Hamburger P. Joh. Hermes ist der einzige deutsche Jesuit, den wir vor 1616 in den Missionen nachweisen können."

[27] *Mex. 4*, ff. 168–185.

each comes from Germany, Denmark, Portuguese Africa, and the Netherlands (Groningen).

The next extant catalogue is that of 1614. These seven years show a remarkable growth for the rapidly expanding Province, which now numbers 326, an increase of sixty-one. For the first time, the native vocations soar above the hundred mark—the exact number is 104. Further, 191 are native Spaniards (although very many had entered the Order in Mexico), eleven are from Italy, ten from Portugal, four from France, and one each from Ireland, England, the island of Chios, Germany, the Netherlands, and the Neuvo Reino de Granada (Colombia).[28]

According to the next extant catalogue, that of 1620, a no less satisfactory rise in the number of Jesuits working in the Mexican Province is to be noted. As we are here concerned with the statistics only until 1619, the year of Mercado's death, we shall disregard those entries subsequent to that year. In 1619, there were in the entire Province 348; of these 121 are native born, as compared with 185 Spaniards, eighteen Italians, eleven Portugnese, four French, four Belgians, ane one each from the Netherlands, the island of Chios, Germany, the Nuevo Reino de Granada, and Ireland.[29]

These statistics would seem to present quite a different picture from what one would form from the official legislation of the period and the instructions sent by European religious superiors. Yet these catalogues formed part of the official reports sent to Rome by the Provincials of the Mexican Province, hence there was no secret about the number of native vocations admitted to the Jesuit Order in Mexico. That such a large number—two hundred and thirty-five, it will be recalled—could claim New Spain as their native land, not only shows that the Jesuit Mexican Province had "taken root," but that a very liberal policy had been followed in the admission of native vocations, and that such proved capable and satisfactory members of the Order.[30]

Native Spaniards constituted a majority in the Mexican Province until about the mid-seventeenth century, but the rapid expansion

---

[28] *Ibid.*, ff. 187–205. The Irish Jesuit is Father Michael Wadding (Godínez in Spanish); cf. E. J. Burrus, S.J., "Michael Wadding, Mystic and Missionary (1586–1644)," in *The Month*, vol. 197 (June, 1954), 339–353. The English Jesuit was Brother "Juan Caro, de Blemua en Inglaterra."

[29] *Mex. 4*, ff. 239–260.

[30] *Congr. 42*, f. 308, "... hasta agora la Congregación siente bien de los novicios," were the words already of the 1577 Provincial Congregation.

both in the interior of the country through the establishment of churches and schools, as well as along the relatively unorganized frontier through the founding of mission centers for the Indians, was possible only because of the numerous native vocations. Finally, the official records show a larger number of Jesuits from non-Spanish countries than had hitherto been noted.[31]

ERNEST J. BURRUS

Institutum Historicum
Societatis Jesu, Roma

[31] The only attempt at cataloguing all foreigners in the Spanish overseas dominions is L. de Aspurz, O.F.M, *La aportación extranjera a las misiones españoles*, Madrid, 1946. Father Aspurz had listed for this period in New Spain sixteen foreigners, but of these one was born in Spain, namely Bernabé Jordano.

Philippine Linguistics and Spanish Missionaries, 1565-1700

When the six Augustinian friars arrived in Cebu on February 13, 1565, with the *Adelantado* Miguel López de Legazpi, they were able to draw upon a vast storehouse of missionary experience acquired in North and in South America. The friars had learned the necessity of preaching the Gospel to the natives in their own tongues. Only thus could the message of Christianity reach the Indians' hearts. The natives were to be asked to repudiate their pagan cults but not their mother tongues. In 1582 the Ecclesiastical Junta extended this axiom of Spanish missionary procedure to the Philippines.[1]

The salient characteristic of the linguistic landscape of the Philippines has been diversity. On the island of Luzon alone there were six major languages, many minor ones and a host of dialects. A list of *encomiendas* and tributes compiled in 1591 reveals the distribution of the major linguistic groups on Luzon in round numbers. The Tagalog speaking peoples were 124,000, the Ilocano 75,000, the Vicol 77,000, the Pagasinan (only partly reduced at the time) 24,000, the Pampanga 75,000, and Ibanag (Cagayan) 96,000.[2] The largest single linguistic group was the Bisayan which occupied the central islands of the archipelago. There were and are, at least, three principal dialects of that language. All of the Philippine tongues go back to a common root the generic East Indian speech, which is popularly known as Malay. In many cases this linguistic diversity molded the character and shaped the direction of the whole missionary enterprise.[3]

This fact directly influenced the composition of the missionary expeditions that were periodically dispatched from Spain. Experience taught the religious superiors that men between the ages twenty-five and thirty were more apt at acquiring fluency in foreign lan-

---

1 Juan de la Concepción, *Historia general de Philipinas*, 14 vols., Manila, 1788–1792, II, 54.

2 Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1803*, 53 vols., Cleveland, 1903–1907, VIII, 96–141.

3 For a brief summary of the linguistic situation see A. L. Kroeber, *The Peoples of the Philippines*, New York, 1928, 73–80. Without committing ourselves too deeply a geographical explanation of this linguistic diversity may be suggested. Most of the Islands are divided into two distinct regions by central mountain ranges.

guages. Older men were often unable to learn them. Significant is the example of the first Dominican mission to the Philippines which consisted mostly of elderly friars of outstanding spiritual qualities. The aim was to set a lofty example of monastic virtue to the natives and thus to arouse their respect for the new religion. These friars, however, turned out to be bad linguists. The Dominicans were eventually compelled to reverse their policy and to send to the islands younger men.[4] Alonso Sánchez stressed the necessity of dispatching men young enough to learn languages.[5] The Council of the Indies once pointed out to the Franciscans the risks of sending friars to the Indies who were mere youths.[6] If the sincerity of their religious vocation had not been sufficiently tested, in the Indies they sometimes ended up living lives that were anything but edifying. The Augustinians in the Philippines were to find out to their sorrow how a group of youths lacking a solid sense of their calling could rapidly demoralize a whole religious house or province. Not aware of the dangers involved the missionary Orders, nevertheless, continued to send younger men to the Indies, for it was generally recognized that they were apt to be more competent linguists.

Linguistic studies in the Philippines during the first decades, 1565–1593, got off to an inauspicious start. Exceptional was the case of Friar Martín de Rada who amazed the Cebuans by learning to preach fluently in Bisayan within five months of his arrival. A gifted linguist, Rada may have composed a Bisayan grammar.[7] He also learned to speak Chinese. The early Augustinians on the whole were not rated as outstanding linguists. In 1576 Governor Sande wrote Philip II that of the thirteen Augustinian friars who could say Mass, "I am not sure that any one of them understands the language of the natives."[8] There is some but not enough evi-

---

[4] Diego Aduarte, O.P., *Historia de la provincia de sancto rosario de la orden de predicadores en Philippinas, Iapón y China*, Manila, 1693, 64–65.

[5] Francisco Colín, S.J., *Labor evangélica*, edited by Pablo Pastells, S.J., Barcelona, 1900–1902, I, 506.

[6] Louis Arroyo, O.F.M., "Comisarios generales de Indias," in *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, XII, no. 46 (April–June, 1952), 133. Another advantage in sending younger men was that they were more apt to adjust to the different climate more readily.

[7] Juan de Grijalva, O.S.A., *Crónica de la Orden . . . de S. Agustín en las provincias de Nueva España*, Mexico, 1624, 124. Juan de Medina, O.S.A., *Historia de los sucesos de la orden de . . . S. Agustín de estas islas filipinas*, published in the *Biblioteca histórica filipina*, 4 vols., Manila, IV, 53–54. Medina writes that he himself saw a manuscript copy of Rada's Bisayan Grammar in the Augustinian convent at Cebu City.

[8] Governor Sande to King, Manila, June 17, 1576, in Blair and Robertson, IV, 87.

dence to suggest that Friar Juan de Quiñones, another Augustinian, composed the first grammar in Tagalog.[9]

Linguistic studies as such did not really get under way until the Franciscan Custody's chapter meeting in 1580 when Friar Juan de Plasencia was commissioned by his superiors to write in Tagalog a grammar, a dictionary and a catechism.[10] In 1582 the Ecclesiastical Junta approved these texts.[11] On May 8, 1584, Philip II ordered that no grammar or catechism be published in the islands without the approval of the Bishop and the Audiencia.[12] The aim was to establish a system of supervision and thus avoid doctrinal disputes by striving for uniformity in translations.

Plasencia was a Tagalogist of renown. Born a member of the noble family of Portocarrero in Extremadura, from where many of the conquistadores and the missionaries came, Plasencia arrived in the Philippines on June 24, 1577, with the first Franciscan mission. He had the good fortune of encountering a Spanish boy, Miguel de Talavera, who had come to the Philippines with his parents in the Legazpi expedition. As a child he learned to speak Tagalog fluently. The pious legend of the missionary chroniclers is that Talavera was handed over to the care of Plasencia by his parents as a punishment for childish pranks in destroying pagan idols in the homes of his Tagalog companions. The boy's antics had so aroused the wrath of the natives that Talavera's parents feared a retaliation.[13] The relation between the master and the student proved fruitful. Talavera taught Plasencia the fundamentals of Tagalog and Plasencia in turn drilled Talavera in the rudiments of Latin. Talavera

---

9 Juan de Medina, *Historia de S. Agustín*, 156.

10 Francisco de Santa Inés, O.F.M., *Crónica de la provincia de San Gregorio magno de religiosos descalzos de N.S.P. San Francisco en las islas Filipinas, China, Japón . . .*, 2 vols., Manila, 1892, II, 211. Juan Francisco de San Antonio, O.F.M., *Chrónicas de la apostolica provincia de San Gregorio de religiosos descalzos de n. s. p. S. Francisco en las islas Philipinas, China, Japón . . .*, 3 vols., Sampaloc, 1738–1744, I, 532. Eusebio Gómez Platero y Fernández Portillo, O.F.M., *Catálogo biográfico de los religiosos franciscanos de la provincia de S. Gregorio Magno de Filipinas desde 1577 . . . hasta nuestros dias . . .*, Manila, 1880, 17–18.

11 *Ibid.*

12 The text of this cedula is in José Toribio Medina, *La imprenta en Manila desde sus orígines hast 1810*, 2 vols., Santiago de Chile, 1896 & 1904, I, p. xxviii. The letter of Bishop Salazar, which provoked the King's cedula, has disappeared. This cedula provided some evidence for Beristain de Sousa's hypothesis that the first book printed in the Philippines was a Tagalog Grammar and Dictionary written by Juan de Quiñones, O.S.A., a theory, however, that has never gained wide acceptance; see *ibid.*, p. xxvi-xxviii, and Edwin Wolf's Introductory Essay to the *Doctrina Christiana: The First Book Printed in the Philippines, Manila, 1593*, Washington, D. C., 1947, 13–15.

13 Gómez Platero and Portillo, *Catálogo*, 49-50.

ultimately took the Franciscan habit. The career of Alonso de Molina in Mexico was similar to Talavara's in that Molina as a boy taught the first Franciscans Nahuatl. He eventually became a Franciscan himself.[14] Without the aid of Talavera it is doubtful whether Plasencia could have completed his Tagalog texts in such a short space of time.

In 1593 the first books were printed in the Philippines executed not in type but by the so-called xylographic method. The first book printed in the Philippines like the first book published in Mexico City and Lima was a *Doctrina Christiana.* Both books were bilingual texts, one in Spanish and Tagalog and the other in Chinese and Spanish. A good deal of historical detective work has been expended in the quest to determine the authorship of the anonymous Tagalog *Doctrina.* A great deal of the evidence points in the direction of Juan de Plasencia. He died in 1590 some three years before the publication of the *Doctrina.* It is reasonable to suggest that the *Doctrina* of 1593 may be the version of Plasencia's catechism which was revised by Friar Juan de Oliver between 1583 and 1586.[15]

In the Philippines no one disputed the desirability of retaining the Spanish words in the Tagalog text for the key concepts of the Christian doctrine. Decades before the Mexican Church decided in favor of this procedure after a spirited controversy.[16] The aim was not to make it easy for the natives to identify Christian ideas with certain aspects of their pagan cults. In the *Doctrina* of 1593 the following key Christian concepts were kept in Spanish: God, Trinity, Holy Ghost, Virgin Mary, the Pope, grace, sin, cross, hell, holy church, Sunday, and the names of the sacraments.

By analyzing Tagalog grammar in a systematic fashion, Plasencia, Oliver, and Talavera laid the firm linguistic foundation for the missionary enterprise. On April 27, 1594, the government of Philip II took a step which proved to be of decisive importance. The Governor and the Bishop were instructed to divide up the Philippines into contiguous areas among the four missionary Orders. In the resulting partition carried out by the authorities in Manila all the Orders were allotted parishes in the Tagalog country, the provinces

---

14 Robert Ricard, *La "conquête spirituelle" du Mexique,* Paris, 1933, 72.

15 Wolf regards the *Doctrina* of 1593 as the Talavera-Plasencia-Oliver texts. The most authoritative analysis of the first books printed in the Philippines is Wolf's Introductory Essay. Other outstanding contributions to this topic are Toribio Medina's *La Imprenta* and W. E. Retana, *La Imprenta en Filipinas: adiciones y observaciones de la Imprenta en Manila de J. T. Medina,* Madrid, 1897.

16 Ricard, *La "conquête spirituelle,"* 72–75.

adjacent to Manila. The Augustinians and the Jesuits divided up the Bisayan islands between them. The Augustinians also retained many convents in Ilokos and Pampanga. The Dominicans were assigned the care of the Chinese and the provinces of Pangasinan and Cagayan. The Franciscans took charge of the Camerines. Shortly afterwards an episcopal reorganization of the Philippines complemented the territorial and ethnic partition of the islands among the Orders. In the place of one bishopric for the whole archipelago, the Pope raised Manila to the rank of a metropolitan archdiocese with three suffragan sees in Cagayan, the Camarines and Cebu.[17]

The outstanding practical advantage that resulted from the cedula of April 27, 1594, was that it enabled each Order to concentrate its linguistic studies in two or three or at most four languages. From the Crown's point of view there were acute disadvantages to this arrangement. A settled policy of the Crown's ecclesiastical administration had been not to allow any one religious Order to dominate a large contiguous, ethnic-territorial area.[18] A notable exception to this policy was the Seven Missions that the Jesuits organized in Paraguay in 1630. The Crown tolerated such a territorial concentration of power because these missions acted as an effective barrier against further Portuguese penetration from Brazil. The Crown on the whole encouraged the growth of the power of the episcopacy and the Secular clergy to offset the influence of the Regular clergy. Missionary Orders were balanced against each other. The Crown's aim was to create a situation in which its representatives could wield the balance of power. The cedula of 1594 violated this principle. Only in the Tagalog provinces were all the Orders represented. The parishes in the Diocese of the Camarines for example were virtually monopolized by the Franciscans. The Diocese of Cagayan was partitioned between the Dominicans and the Augus-

---

[17] Letter of Philip II to his Ambassador in Rome, June 17, 1595, in Blair and Robertson, IX, 150–153. For the text of the Bull see *Archivo histórico Hispano-Americano*, III, Madrid, 1915, 335–359; Thomas Ripoll, O.P., *Bullarium ordinis ff. praedicatorum*, 8 vols., Rome, 1729–1740, V, 625.

[18] For a clear statement of the Crown's instinctive distrust for any scheme involving the territorial partition of dioceses with one whole see being assigned to a particular Order see the letter of Viceroy Enríquez of New Spain to Philip II: May 20, 1578, in *Cartas de Indias*, Madrid, 1877, 315–322. Lic. Juan de Ovando, President of the Council of the Indies, had considered such a plan for Mexico, a project which was proposed to him by the Franciscan, Gerónimo de Mendieta; Letter of Gerónimo de Mendieta to Lic. Juan de Ovando, circa May–June, 1571, in *Cartas de religiosos de Nueva España, 1539–94*, Joaquín García Icazbalceta, editor, 2nd edition, Mexico, 1941, 104.

tinians with the former dominating the Cagayan valley and Pangasinan and the latter administering the Ilokano parishes. In discussing the problem of episcopal visitation it will be seen how the Orders' territorial concentration of power was one factor which enables the regular clergy to resist tenaciously the persistent attempts of the bishops to supervise the conduct of the friars in their capacity as parish priests. It was the linguistic diversity of the Philippines that compelled this radical departure of royal policy. In the discussions culminating in the cedula of 1594 the influence and the first-hand information provided by Alonso Sánchez and Bishop Salazar, both recent visitors at the Court of Philip II, cannot be discounted, although it is difficult to assess it precisely.[19]

As a consequence of the cedula of 1594 each Order was allowed to confine its linguistic studies to a few languages. The printing presses in the Philippines existed to meet the practical needs of a missionary outpost, to extend Bolton's phrase to the Orient, "on the rim of Christendom." The four printing presses were operated by the religious groups. The Dominican press was established in 1593. The Franciscan press published its first book in 1606. The Jesuit press was probably founded before 1610. The Augustinian press published only three books between 1618 and 1621. Between 1593 and 1648 as many as eighty-one books may have been published from these presses. Philippine incunabula are not distinguished for the quality of their printing. The printing was inferior to that of Spanish America, and the use of fragile rice paper helps account for the present scarcity of these volumes.

The bulk of Philippine imprints are linguistic studies—grammars (*arte*), dictionaries (*vocabulario*), catechisms, confessionals (*confesionario*) and *Doctrinas Christianas*. The *Doctrinas Christianas* and the confessionals were two characteristic and popular publications of the missionary presses. The typical *Doctrina Christiana* was a handbook of the basic beliefs of Christianity that the friars wished to teach the natives, a kind of expanded catechism. It usually contained the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, Credo, Salve Regina, the Articles of Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Commandments of the Church, the Seven Mortal Sins, the Fourteen Works of Charity, the Confiteor and the catechism. The confessional was another

[19] For the text of the cedula (Aranjuez: April 27, 1954) providing for the territorial partition of the Philippines among the missionary Orders see Blair and Robertson, IX, 120–121. Colín credits his fellow-Jesuit, Alonso Sánchez with persuading the government of Philip II to adopt this policy. Colín, *Labor*, II, 8–9.

handbook to assist the priest in asking the right questions and understanding the answers in the confessional. These books were not designed primarily to be read by the Filipinos, many of whose upper classes could read. The purpose of the handbooks was to give the friars a sufficient grasp of the particular language to enable them to preach in that tongue and to adminiister the sacraments.

Publication statistics are revealing. Between 1593 and 1648 twenty-four Tagalog books appeared. In the same period only five books were published in Bisayan, three in Pampanga, two in Vicol, one in Ilokano and none in Ibangag. It was not until 1689 that the first book was published in Pangasinan. In the seventeenth century the Franciscans were the leaders in linguistic research. Franciscan friars published seventeen books, Augustinians twelve, Dominicans eleven and Jesuits five.[20]

What stands out immediately is the overwhelming emphasis placed on Tagalog studies. Twenty-four books were printed in that language, whereas only five books were published in Bisayan. There were, of course, many more Bisayan manuscripts which did circulate. The contrast is all the more startling in view of the fact that the Bisayans were the largest single ethnic group in the Spanish Philippines. The concentration in Tagalog to the neglect of the other languages can only be explained as the direct consequence of the strategic importance of Manila in the Spanish imperial scheme of things. Since all four religious bodies administered parishes in the Tagalog provinces, each Order was encouraged to make its contribution to the study of that language. On the periphery of the Tagalog area one, or at the most two Orders, tended to dominate a whole ethnic group which the result that it had to bear alone the burden of linguistic research.

The Spanish missionaries' task would have been greatly facilitated had they been able to convert one language into a *lingua franca* or an *idioma general.* To them it seemed that Tagalog was the best developed of all the native tongues and the language that could aspire to this role.[21] There is no evidence, however, to indicate that

[20] The definitive chronological list of all the books printed in the Philippines is still that of Toribio Medina. For a few items overlooked by Medina consult Angel Pérez, O.S.A., and Cecilio Güemes, O.S.A., *Adiciones y continuación de la "Imprenta en Manila de J. T. Medina,"* Manila, 1905.

[21] The general impression of the missionary chroniclers was that Tagalog was the best developed of all the Filipino languages. Pedro Chirino, S.J., *Relación de las islas Filipinas,* Manila, 1890, 52–55. First edition Rome, 1604. Colín *Labor Evangélica,* I, 55–59. Santa Inés, *Crónica,* 43. San Antonio, *Chrónicas,* I, 144–146.

the friars were able to spread Tagalog on the same scale that the missionaries in Mexico taught many Indians to speak Nahuatl.[22]

Bisayan linguistic studies were to some extent the victim of Manila's over-riding importance. Also the fact that the three major dialects of the languages are mutually intelligible was undoubtedly a contributing factor in retarding Bisayan research. Before 1578, Martín de Rada probably wrote a Bisayan grammar. As of 1600 there was a Bisayan translation of a *Doctrina Christiana.* In that year the Bishop of Cebu, Pedro de Agurto, O.S.A., convoked a diocesan synod in Cebu City in which the linguistic question figured prominently. The synod appointed a committee consisting of two representatives of the Augustinians, the Jesuits, and the diocesan clergy to revise and correct the *Doctrina Christiana* which had already been translated. The synod approved the Tagalog Catechism, presumably the Catechism that was included in the published *Doctrina* of 1593. A group of Augustinian friars was commissioned to translate it into Bisayan. None of these works were ever published, nor do we know what dialect was selected. Pedro Chirino, who was present at the sessions of the synod, remarked that the dialect chosen was the "vulgate" form, which was generally used in the whole Bisayan area. The meaning of his words, however, is obscure, for the three principal dialects are not mutually intelligible.[23]

The first book printed in Bisayan came out in 1610. It was a translation of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine's Catechism, a book that was to enjoy widespread popularity in the Philippines, eventually being translated into Vicol, Ilokano, Tagalog and Pampanga. Cristóbal Ximénez's rendition of Bellarmine was reprinted three times between 1610 and 1732. Yet today no copy survives.[24] It was translated into the Samarenyo dialect spoken on the islands of Samar and Leyte where the Jesuits administered many parishes. Domingo Ezgverra, another Jesuit, published in 1662 a grammar in the same dialect, which was reprinted in 1746.[25] Juan Antonio Campion, also a Jesuit, compiled a Bisayan dictionary as well as a collection of sermons, and Francisco Encínas (1570–1633) and José Sánchez (1613–1692) left various Bisayan studies which circulated in manuscript form. The Bisayan dictionary of Mateo Sánchez (1562–1618)

---

22 The missionaries in America spread Nahuatl in Mexico, Tupi in Brazil, Quichua in Peru and Guaraní in Argentina; Ricard, 68.

23 Chirino, *Relación,* 213; Colín, *Labor Evangélica,* II, 278.

24 Toribio Medina, II, 12.

25 *Ibid,* 54.

bears a Manila imprint of 1711.[26] In 1637 Alonso de Mentrida, an Augustinian, published a grammar and a Catechism in the Hiligaina dialect spoken on the islands of Panay and Eastern Negros.[27] Marcos Gavilán completed in manuscript form a Hiligaina version of the catechism and a volume of sermons.[28] So did Juan de Borja and Nicholás de la Cuadra (1663–1723).[29] It was not until 1731 that the first book in Cebuano was printed. Cebuano is spoken in Cebu, Western Leyte, parts of Negros and the northern and eastern coasts of Mindanao. In the eighteenth century linguistic research in the Bisayan dialects received something like the attention that the subject deserved. During this period the Jesuits published ten items, the Augustinians five and the Augustinian Recollects two.

The pioneer studies of Juan de Plasencia, Miguel de Talavera and Juan de Oliver foreshadowed the outstanding linguistic achievement of the Franciscan Order. Pedro de San Buenaventura, Gerónimo Monte and Alonso de Santa Ana were all Tagalogists of distinction. They compiled grammars and dictionaries. They translated catechisms and confessionals many of which were printed.[30]

Most books written or printed in Vicol language were done by Franciscan friars, for virtually all the parishes in that province were administered by priests of that Order. The earliest work in Vicol was a catechism translated by an Augustinian friar, Juan de Alva, who died in 1577. Juan de Oliver, an outstanding Tagalogist, was equally fluent in Vicol writing six books in that language including a *Doctrina Christiana* and a confessional.[31] None, however, were published. The Portuguese-born Marcos de Lisboa compiled a grammar and a dictionary and translated a Catechism into Vicol

---

[26] Robert Streit, O.M.I., *Biblioteca Missionum*, 20 vols., Munster and Aachen, 1916—, V. 334. Streit compiled the most complete list of unpublished linguistic items done by missionary priests. There is a list of Jesuit linguistic studies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Carlos Sommervogel, S.J., *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jèsus*, 11 vols., Brussels and Paris, 1890–1932, X, 983. For Bisayan manuscripts see *ibid.*, II, 597; III, 391; VII, 527–528. Encinas wrote a dictionary and books on confession and the Eucharist; José Sánchez left a collection of sermons and a dictionary.

[27] Toribio Medina, I, 34.

[28] Streit, V, 342.

[29] *Ibid.*, V, 332, 337.

[30] For the Franciscan publications see Toribio Medina, I, 13, 14, 26, 46, 87, 115, 241.

[31] For Juan de Alva's studies see Elviro Pérez, O.S.A., *Catálogo biobibliográfico de los religiosos Augustinos de la provincia del santisimo nombre de Jesús de las islas filipinas desde su fundación hasta nuestra dias*, Manila, 1901, 9. For Juan de Oliver's Vicol studies see Streit, IV, 365–366.

between 1602 and 1611. The dictionary was not printed until 1754.[32] Andrés de San Agustín published in 1647 a Vicol grammar and a translation of Bellarmine's catechism.[33] He also left many volumes of sermons.[34]

The linguistic studies of the Augustinians included the four ethnic groups to whom they administered—Tagalog, Bisayan, Pampanga and Ilokano. Francisco López (died 1631) translated into Ilokano Bellarmine's catechism, a book that went through four printings between 1621 and 1767. He also composed a dictionary and a grammar in that language. The grammar was printed in 1627 and 1793. The dictionary was not published until 1849.[35] Two other Augustinians wrote unpublished works in Ilokano. Pedro de la Cruz Avila, whose death occurred in 1617, wrote a grammar, a dictionary and a catechism.[36] Antonio Santos Mejia, Alonso Cortés and Manuel de la Cruz left various volumes of sermons.[37] His book on the Passion of Our Lord was not published until 1845 in Madrid.[38]

Diego de Ochao was the pioneer in the study of the language of Pampanga. Before his death in 1585 he wrote a grammar, a dictionary and a confessional in that language.[39] The outstanding student of this tongue was Francisco Coronel. In 1621 he published in Pampanga a catechism, a dictionary and a grammar. The catechism was reprinted in 1741, 1858, 1875 and 1901.[40] Juan de Cabello published a devotional work in 1647.[41] Juan de Medina, who is best known for his chronicle of the Augustinian province, wrote four volumes of unpublished sermons in Pampanga. So did Pedro García Serrano and Enrique Castro. Alvaro's Pampanga grammar was never published nor was Juan de Jérez's manuscript on the Passion of Our Lord.[42]

The parishioners of the Dominicans like those of the Augustinians

---

32 Toribio Medina, I, 164.
33 *Ibid.*, I, 45.
34 Pedro de la Asunción also wrote unpublished sermons in Vicol; Streit, V, 353.
35 Toribio Medina, I, 25, 225.
36 Pérez, *Catálogo*, 36.
37 *Ibid.*, 89; Streit, V, 336–337.
38 The passion of Jesus was translated into many Philippine languages. It was often read aloud in a kind of lay religious service held in private homes during Lent.
39 Pérez, *Catálogo*, 19.
40 *Ibid.*, 80.
41 *Ibid.*, 89. At the time of his death he was working on a Pampanga translation of Luis de Granada's *Símbolo de la fé*, one of the classics of Spanish mysticism.
42 *Ibid.*, 85, 90, 116, and Streit, V, 334.

spoke four different languages—Chinese, Tagalog, Ibanag and Pangasinan. Between 1593 and 1648 the Dominicans published three books in Chinese, for the large Chinese colony in the Manila area was under the care of the Dominicans. Francisco Blancas de San José, to whose initiative must be credited the establishment of the typographical printing in the Philippines, was the most eminent Tagalogist of the Dominican Order. His Tagalog grammar was first published in 1610, but it was reprinted in 1752 and 1832. Among his other publications are a confessional, an explanation of Holy Communion, and a textbook to teach Castillian to the Tagalogs.[43] Francisco Blancas de San José actually had no real successors among the Dominicans as a student of the Tagalog tongue.

The province of Cagayan in Northern Luzon was administered by the Dominicans. The only studies in the language of that region, Ibanag, were done by members of that Order. It is an extraordinary fact to record that no linguistic items in Ibanag were published until the nineteenth century. In the seventeenth century a few Dominicans did compile grammars and dictionaries which did circulate in manuscript form. Jacinto Pardo (died 1605) was the first to undertake a systematic analysis of the language.[44] His studies were continued by Gaspar Zarfate.[45] Another contemporary, Ambrosio Martínez de la Madre de Dios compiled a grammar and a dictionary.[46] So did José Bugarín whose dictionary enjoyed a somewhat belated publication in 1854.[47] Juan de Montoya translated the catechism into Ibanag.[48] Marcos Saavedra compiled an Ibanag grammar and a collection of sermons.[49]

Pangasinan was another language that the Dominicans studied. As early as 1595 Tomás Castellar had written in manuscript form a brief grammar and a dictionary in that language.[50] It was not until 1689 that Sebastián del Castillo published the first book in Pangansinan called *Gobierno Christiano.*[51] In 1690 a grammar was published anonymously which was printed in 1840 and 1862.[52]

---

43 Toribio Medina, I, 7–11.

44 Hilario María Ocio y Viana, O.P., *Compendio de la reseña biográfica de los religiosos de la provincia del santísimo rosario de Filipinas desde su fundación hasta nuestros dias,* Manila, 1895, 56–57.

45 *Ibid.,* 30.

46 *Ibid.,* 29.

47 *Ibid.,* 152–153.

48 Streit, V, 351.

49 *Ibid.,* V, 354.

50 Ocio y Viana, *Compendio,* 23–24. Pedro de la Cruz also did a Pangasinan grammar and dictionary; Streit, V, 365.

51 Toribio Medina, II, 35.

52 *Ibid.,* I, 74.

In the seventeenth century friars of the Recollect branch of the Augustinian Order, who arrived in the Philippines in 1606, did not publish any linguistic items. As the smallest Order in the islands and the last to arrive, their missions were scattered in various parts of the archipelago from the Zambal country in Luzon to the northeastern coast of Mindanao. They apparently used the linguistic studies done by friars of the other Orders.

The regular clergy emphasized understandably enough the major languages of the Philippines. There are only a few linguistic manuscripts for the minor languages or dialects such as Zambal, or Lutuaya (Mindanao) or Ilongot. On the whole the minor tongues received scant notice, but this does not mean to imply that they were unknown.[53]

The years between 1593 and 1648 represent the pioneer period in linguistic studies. In the second half of the seventeenth century a general decline set in. Only eight books were published in the native languages during those years. In the eighteenth century many gaps of the first-half century were filled.

The brief outline of the linguistic activities of the missionaries with special stress on the seventeenth century leads to one conclusion. The effort was laborious, even heroic, but it was inadequate. The exception is Tagalog studies. The relatively large number of grammars, dictionaries, catechisms and confessionals suggests that the missionary linguists did begin to grasp the fundamentals of that tongue. It is difficult to make this assumption in the case of the other languages. The fact that no books were published in Ibanag is noteworthy. It seems to imply that the Dominican priests regarded their linguistic studies in Ibanag as not adequate enough to justify the expense of publication. In any case it is certain that the publication of a grammar, a dictionary and a catechism would have facilitated the missionary labors of the Dominicans in the province of Cagayan. Only the bare minimum was accomplished in Bisayan, Vicol, Pampanga, Pangasinan and Ilokano. In each one of these tongues there was usually one grammar, one dictionary, one catechism and sometimes one confessional. This represents the first step in linguistic research and nothing more. If many different grammars and catechisms were considered desirable in order to dominate Tagalog, it stands to reason that many more studies in the other languages would have given the religious Orders a more

53 References to these manuscripts are in Streit, IV, 346, 364, and 352.

penetrating command of those tongues. These linguistic studies, however, were not undertaken.

The utilitarian note was always predominant. The friars did enough linguistic research in order to enable them to discharge their sacerdotal obligations. Oftentimes they fell short of their goal. So did their colleagues in Mexico where linguistic research was done on a much larger scale commensurate with the greater value and prestige attached to that colony by the Spanish authorities.[54] This is not to say that the regular clergy in the Philippines did not usually speak the language of their flocks with passable fluency. There are few complaints in the religious chronicles about the excessive difficulty of learning those tongues. What Philippine studies did lack, however, was an investigator of the stature of Friar Bernardino de Sahagún who managed to combine Christian zeal, disinterested scholarship and a deep curiosity to unravel the mysteries of native culture. In the Philippines the only serious pretender to this honor would be the seventeenth-century Jesuit historian of the Bisayans, Francisco Alcina, but he was an ethnologist rather than a student of linguistics.

Since the Spaniards were unable to make Tagalog into an *idioma general,* why did they not attempt to impose Castilian as the *lingua franca?* The Spanish Crown sanctioned the practice of instructing the natives in their own tongues. Bishops were under standing instructions not to assign a priest to a parish when he did not know the language spoken there by the natives.[55] The religious Orders, like the Jesuits, had a rule that their members learn the language of the country where they were stationed. Chairs of native languages were endowed by the government at universities and colleges throughout the Indies. After 1550 the Crown often proclaimed its desire that the natives eventually learn Castilian. The native tongues were alleged to be not sufficiently well developed to transmit the mysteries of the Faith. There was a genuine fear among the civil authorities that idolatries and superstitions would persist until the natives abandoned the languages of their pagan past. The aim was to make Spaniards out of the Indians with the natives gradually

---

54 Ricard, *La conquête,* 70–79, has an estimate of the inadequacy of linguistic research in Mexico.

55 Blair and Robertson, XX, 250–253. *Recopilación de las leyes de los reynos de las Indias,* 4 vols., Madrid, 1943, I, 45, 95–96, 132. The first edition was published in Madrid, 1681. Diego de Encinas, *Cedulario indiano,* 4 vols., Madrid, 1945, I, 98–99, 100–101; IV, 338. The first edition was published in 1596.

acquiring the social habits of the conquerors.[56] Not to be discounted in assessing the mentality of the civil authorities is that frame of mind best exemplified in the anecdote still popular in Spain today about the languages that Charles V spoke. The Emperor made love in Italian, conferred with diplomats in French, spoke to his dogs in English, gave orders to his horse in German and he conversed with God in Castilian.

Between 1550 and 1688 the royal policy throughout the Empire was two-fold. The natives were to be instructed in their own tongue. The resolve of those Indians who wished of their own free will to learn Castilian was vigorously encouraged. Primary schools for the natives were ordered established with Spanish as the obligatory language of instruction. It was suggested that the practice in Spain be introduced into the Indies. The sacristans in the churches were to be the schoolmasters, or schoolmasters were to be paid out of the funds of the communal treasuries, the *cajas de comunidades*.[57] After 1688 the Crown abandoned its voluntary policy and sought in a series of measures to compel the natives to learn Spanish.[58] Both methods of the Crown produced dismal results in the Philippines. At the end of the Spanish regime the American census reported that less than ten per centum of the population could speak Spanish.[59]

During the reign of Charles III (1759–1788) when the spirit of the French Enlightenment penetrated to the ruling circles of

---

[56] The Crown launched its hispanization program in a series of cedulas dispatched to the leading civil and ecclesiastical authorities dated at Valladolid on June 7, 1550. *Ibid.*, IV, 339–340. For later expressions of this policy see *ibid.; Recopilación*, I, 96. Cedulas of May 30, 1951, July 3, 1596, and August 8, 1687, in *Archivo General de Indias, Indiferente General*, 431. The specific application of the hispanization decrees to the Philippines did not occur until 1596. For an articulate expression of the hostility of some civil authorities towards the continuance of the native tongues see Juan de Solórzano Pereira, *Política indiana*, 5 vols., Madrid and Buenos Aires, 1930, I, 396–344. First edition is 1647.

[57] For the King's orders to teach Castilian to the Filipinos see Philip II's Instructions to Governor Tello: Toledo, May 25, 1596, in Blair and Robertson, IX, 255–256. Letter of the Audiencia to Philip III, July 3, 1606, in the *Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Filipinas*, 19. The second cédula concerning the teaching of Castilian was dispatched on July 25, 1605.

[58] The cedula signed in Madrid on July 20, 1686, provided that the Christian doctrine be explained to the natives in Spanish. Charles III on April 11, 1770, reversed the historic policy of the Crown when he informed the Archbishop of Mexico that parish priests in the viceroyalty (including the Philippines) did not have to know the language of their parishioners. For the next text of this cédula see Manuel Merino, O.S.A., *Missionalía hispánica*, V, (No. 14, Madrid, 1914) 289–292.

[59] *Census of the Philippine Islands*, 1903, 3 vols., Washington, 1905, III, 583, 594, 595 and 689; Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines Past and Present*, New York, 1930, 671.

Spain, there was little hesitation about where to place the blame for this outstanding failure. The regular clergy were accused of deliberately refusing to teach the Filipinos Castilian. The charge was often made that the friars sought to keep the natives isolated from the Spanish community and therefore more amenable to the supervision of the Regulars. All the accusers of the friars were motivated by longstanding grievances against the secular clergy. Behind the protests of the itinerant merchants that the friars had the natives whipped publicly for talking in Spanish is a thinly veiled restlessness at the restrictions imposed on their trading with the natives, which the friars devised ostensibly to protect their charges from being cheated by unscrupulous merchants. The Governors of the time were engaged in a titanic effort to compel friars in their capacity as parish priests to submit to the supervision of the Bishops. It was said that the Secular clergy eyed with lean and hungry glances the vast array of lucrative benefices held by the Regulars.[60] The conspiracy explanation of historical events usually reveals more about the vital aspirations of the accusers than it does the conduct of the accused.

It is simply an error of fact to assert that the friars deliberately opposed teaching the natives Castilian in the sixteenth or the seventeenth century. As early as 1582 the Ecclesiastical Junta sanctioned the principle that the natives should be taught Castilian.[61] All the missionary Orders immediately adopted the practice of setting up primary schools adjoining the parish churches. There the children of the native chieftains were taught a modicum of reading, writing and music. The language of instruction was Spanish. Juan de Plasencia, the pioneer Tagalogist, was responsible for setting up the primary school system in the Franciscan missions. The friars

60 In a reply to Charles III's cedula of September 21, 1767, the Cathedral Chapter of Manila accused the friars of deliberately disobeying the King's repeated commands about teaching Spanish to the natives for "fines particulares." The Ecclesiastical Junta of 1773 denounced the Regular clergy for opposing the spread of Spanish "para gozar ellos [the Regulars] las doctrinas;" *Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Filipinas*, 1001. So did the French scientist-traveler, Le Gentil, in his book *Voyages dans les mers de l'Inde*, Paris, 1781, in Blair and Robertson, XXVIII, 210–213. Governor Viana and Simón de Anda made the same charges; *ibid.*, L, 119–124 and 169–172. All these accounts share that Enlightenment bias against the Regular clergy which culminated in the dissolution of the Jesuit Order.

61 "Memoria de una junta que se hizó manera de concilio el año de 1582 para dar asiento á las cosas tocantes al aumento de la fé y justificación de la conquista" in Valentín Marín y Morales, O.P., *Ensayo de una síntesis de los trabajos realizados por las corporaciones religiosas españolas de Filipinas*, 2 vols., Manila, 1901, I, 343.

recognized the desirability of training a select minority who could provide a hard-core of missionary supervised leadership in the new Christian communities. The students of these schools performed invaluable service to the missionaries in liquidating external vestiges of paganism and in acting as auxiliaries, in the preaching of the Gospel.[62] What the friars were unable to do was to teach Castilian to the lower classes of their parish. Given the scope of their duties and the paucity of their numbers, the Regulars scarcely had the time or the energy to operate the primary schools for the sons of the native chieftains. Friar Francisco Blancas de San José, the Dominican Tagalogist, published a textbook for Tagalogs to learn Castilian.[63]

The hispanizing program for the Regular clergy was launched before the Crown decided in favor of this course of action. The setting up of primary schools to be staffed by the sacristans or schoolteachers paid from the communal treasuries, as envisaged in the cédulas of May 25, 1596, and July 25, 1605, did not square with the social realities in the Philippines. Hence the cedulas proved ineffectual. The Crown recognized that the friars themselves given their other duties could not also double as schoolteachers. In the communal treasury there was usually enough money to pay for the village's annual fiesta, but there was often a lack of funds for a schoolteacher's salary.[64] There was a shortage of instructors who

---

62 For these schools run by missionaries see Marcel de Ribadeneyra, O.F.M., *Historia de las islas del archipielago,* Barcelona, 1601, 54–55, 65–67; Santa Inés, *Crónica,* II, 47; San Antonio, *Chrónicas,* II, 12–18; Aduarte, *Historia de predicadores,* I, 64; Juan de Medina, *Historia de provincia de S. Agustín,* 75; Colín, *Labor Evangélica,* II, 127, 137 and III, 135. For civilian opinions see the letter of Governor Tello to the King, July 12, 1599, in Blair and Robertson, X, 252–253; Dr. Antonio Morga, *Sucesos de las islas filipinas,* Madrid, 1909, 206. The first edition came out in Mexico in 1609. Morga who on occasion was a severe critic of the Regular clergy evinced a real enthusiasm for what these schools were accomplishing.

63 Toribio Medina, I, 10.

64 It is not at all clear how these communal treasuries actually operated in the Philippines. Like so many other institutions this one also was transported from Mexico. Each adult male was supposed to contribute to the communal treasury one-half a fanega of rice at harvest time. This accumulation of rice was supposed to provide the village with a surplus with which to relieve distress in times of famine, to pay the salaries of the school teachers and other local officials and to defray the expenses of the village's annual fiesta in honor of its patron saint. The minimum salary of a schoolteacher was twenty-four pesos and twelve cavanes of rice. Hernando de los Rios Coronel, representative of the Philippine colony at the Spanish court, claimed that these funds were usually mal-administered. The Spanish civil authorities developed a habit of "borrowing" from the communal treasuries which were never paid back. Between these loans and the expenses of the annual fiesta seldom was there any surplus left in

met even the minimum standards. The natives themselves showed considerable reluctance in sending their children to these schools in villages where they did function. The children's labor services were required in the rice fields. The Spanish civil authorities made fitful and not too successful efforts to compel the natives to send their children to school. Considerable hardship was imposed on the children themselves who had to travel long distances daily to attend classes.[65]

The Filipinos were exposed to Castilian, but the language did not spread. Outside of the immediate vicinity of Manila and a few other towns where the Spanish and mestizo communities were concentrated, the natives seldom saw a Spaniard except the local parish priest. What the Filipinos lacked was a social incentive to learn Castilian, the kind of incentive the American regime provided them with to learn English. From the time of Admiral Dewey the Americans recognized the practical necessity of throwing open to the Filipinos most of the jobs in the civil service. English was made the *sine qua non* for obtaining these positions. The creation of an educational system with English as the obligatory language of instruction spread the new *lingua franca* rapidly. The Filipinos as a people are gifted linguists. Many of them today speak two or three languages. They would have learned Spanish as quickly as they did English, had the Spanish regime provided them with the inducement to do so that the Americans did.

Spanish might have spread, if the plantation economy had developed in the Philippines during the seventeenth century. The example of seventeenth-century Mexico is illuminating for understanding what happened in the Philippines. As a result of the rapid decline of the Indian population and the sharp absolute increase in the numbers of Europeans and castes, the cities of Mexico faced

---

the treasuries at the end of the year. Hernando de los Rios Coronel, "Reforms Needed in the Philippines," (Madrid, 1620) in Blair and Robertson, XVIII, 315. Also see San Antonio, *Chrónicas,* II, 18. Letter of the Audiencia to the King: July 19, 1609, in *Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Filipinas,* 20.

65 For a succinct explanation as to why the Crown's primary school system produced such meagre results in the Philippines see the letter of José Duque, Provincial of the Augustinians, March 21, 1689, in the *Archivo General de Indias, Audiencia de Filipinas,* 25. This letter is also quoted in part by Merino, V, 299–300. Father Merino's article is well-documented especially from Augustinian sources and sound as far as it goes. He marshals an impressive amount of evidence to demonstrate that the Regular clergy did not oppose the spread of Spanish. What happened was that the Filipinos did not take to Castilian when exposed to that language.

starvation. Catastrophe was averted by the rise of large estates with Indian debt peonage furnishing the labor. Debt peonage implied the remorseless if gradual hispanization of the Mexican Indians, for they were thrown in contact with Spaniards and mestizos.[66] A plantation economy did not develope in the Philippines until the nineteenth century with the rise of sugar refining.[67] The gradual hispanization that might have ensued from this new industry was abruptly terminated by the liquidation of the Spanish regime.

The critics of the Regular clergy in the eighteenth century—the Governors, the secular clergy, and the merchants—credited the friars with a power they never had. Regulars could not have prevented the Filipinos from learning Spanish if certain conditions had been present, such as a social incentive for the natives to learn Spanish or the wide-spread existence of a plantation economy.

The Spanish missionary Church might have wished to simplify the complex linguistic pattern that it encountered in the Philippines, for such a development would have facilitated its own labors. The missionaries eventually recognized more realistically than the civil authorities ever did that such a task was beyond their capacity. The Regulars adjusted themselves to the fact of linguistic diversity without sacrificing their primary objective of Christianizing and Westernizing to a degree, at least, the Filipinos. Therein lies a partial explanation for their peculiarly Spanish genius in administering to primitive peoples.

JOHN LEDDY PHELAN*

Newberry Library

66 Woodrow Wilson Borah, *New Spain's Century of Depression* (Ibero-American series), Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951, 41–42.

67 During the eighteenth century an exceptionally fine tobacco crop was raised in the Cagayan valley. The establishment of the government-operated tobacco monopoly in 1782 stopped any growth towards a plantation economy in the tobacco country.

* The author is a Fellow in Philippines Studies at the Newberry Library where he is participating in the Philippine Studies program conducted by the Newberry, the Chicago Natural History Museum and the University of Chicago under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Texas State Aid for Indigent Soldiers, 1861-1865

Historians have long noted the economic weaknesses of the confederate states as compared with those of the North. From the very beginning of the war the southern economy seemed to become increasingly stagnant. In whole areas of the Confederacy there was actually privation and an economic decline which often bore no relationship whatsoever to the proximity of the Union army. These economic deficiencies unquestionably were one of the principal reasons for the southern collapse.

At no point is this economic stagnation more apparent than in the problem of how to care for the families of soldiers.[1] The southern government was burdened from the start with this additional problem. In each of the states it demanded a solution, and a considerable amount of legislation and organized effort was devoted to this purpose. Although it was a problem of nation-wide magnitude, the confederate government was inclined to regard it as one entirely in the province of state concern, and at first the states were equally willing to consider it a local matter.

Charles Ramsdell pointed out that when considering how this problem was handled it was permissable to make some general observations.[2] At first it was regarded as a local matter, but when it grew too extensive state intervention became necessary. A second trend was to give at first monetary relief to these families, and as the currency system collapsed this was replaced by a system of relief in kind. Clothing, food, and other necessities were laboriously distributed to those in need. As home morale became more demoralized toward the end of the war, it became necessary to resort to impressments and requisitions in order to obtain the needed provisions.

A thorough study of the care of the indigent families of soldiers is necessary if we are to acquire a better understanding of the economic problems confronting the Confederacy. Many questions must be answered. How much money was actually available for this purpose, and how many people were receiving aid? How much goods

[1] Bell Irvin Wiley, *The Plain People of the Confederacy*, Baton Rouge, 1944. The general situation among the people of the Confederacy may be conveniently surveyed in this work.

[2] Charles Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, Baton Rouge, 1944, 62–68.

was distributed? What local taxes were levied to supply funds, and how successful were county agents and officials in collecting them? How many persons were diverted from other duties in order to meet the problems of collection and distribution?

In this article an attempt has been made to describe briefly the various methods instituted in Texas for the collection and distribution of goods and money for indigent families of soldiers. It is not a complete study for it does not treat with local efforts to solve the problem. The scope and administration of the system instituted by the state legislature has been examined, and an effort has been made to note similarities and differences between the Texas system and those established elsewhere.

The state legislature first took cognizance of the problem in January 1862 when it adopted a law empowering the county courts to levy a direct ad valorem tax of not more than twenty-five cents on each one hundred dollars of property then subject to taxation. This money was to be collected by the regular assessor and collector in each county, and it was to be used to relieve the destitute families of all persons enlisted in the southern armed services.[3]

Early in 1863 this system was broadened considerably by the passage of two new acts. The first of these appropriated $600,000 from the state treasury to be disbursed at the discretion of the state comptroller to the county courts. The amount given to each county was based upon the scholastic returns and estimates for 1861-62. This money was to be used to provide assistance for the widows, families and dependents of men who had served in the Southern armed forces.[4] The second act merely broadened the system of local aid as originated in 1862. The new law provided that the county court by means of public appropriations or by private donations could acquire funds to supply the needs of soldiers' families. Special taxes not exceeding seventy-five cents on each hundred dollars of taxable property could be levied. District courts were given special power to compel county courts to act if they shirked their responsibilities of caring for these people.[5] By 1863 local assistance was increased and supplemented by direct aid from the state treasury. Presumably distribution was still being made on a monetary basis.

---

[3] *General Laws of the Ninth Legislature of the State of Texas,* c. xxvi, 23–25. January 1, 1862. Repealed November 15, 1864.

[4] *General Laws of the Ninth Legislature of the State of Texas, Extra Session,* c. xvii, 13. March 5, 1863.

[5] *Ibid.,* c. xl, 29–30. March 6, 1863. Repealed November 15, 1864.

In March 1863, another act was passed which introduced the principle of relief in kind. Soldiers' families were entitled to apply to the state penitentiary for cloth, but such applications had to be approved by the chief justice of the county in which the applicants resided.[6]

Before the end of 1863 it became necessary to amend the system again. On December 15, the legislature appropriated one million dollars per annum to support and maintain the families, widows, and dependents of soldiers serving in the armed forces of the South, if such persons were in genuine need. The method for distributing the money was changed slightly. The chief justice of each county was to make returns to the offices of the comptroller before March 1, 1864 and 1865, listing the number of needy persons in his county. The money due each county was to be distributed in semi-annual installments to the county court which was given plenary power to distribute it according to whichever method seemed best. However, the legislators made it clear that they intended the distribution to be made in terms of some kind of necessities rather than cash grants.[7]

The following day another act was passed which made it possible for the county courts to collect for local aid extraordinary taxes of one dollar per hundred dollars of taxable property. Again a provision was included calling for distribution of necessities rather than in cash. Such taxes could be paid either in money or in kind.[8]

Several changes were initiated in the system of relief by the legislature in November, 1864. The annual appropriation of one million dollars was discontinued at that time, but another form of relief was substituted. A new act provided that 600,000 yards of cloth and the excesses of thread manufactured at the state penitentiary were to

---

6 *Ibid.*, c. xxvi, 20. March 6, 1863.

7 *General Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas,* c. xxxiv, 21–22. This law was repealed in November 1864 but the semi-annual distributions to be made March and September 1, 1864 were made. *General Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas, Second Extra Session,* c. xiv, 13. November 15, 1864.

8 *General Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas,* c. xliii, 28–29. This amended the act of March 6, 1863. See also: *Special Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas,* c. xxxix, 28–29, December 16, 1863; *Special Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas, Called Session,* c. xii, 33, May 28, 1864; *Special Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas, Second Extra Session,* c. xxiv, 13. November 15, 1864. These last three laws provided for the collection of special taxes in Galveston, Calhoun, Refugio, San Patricio, and Nueces counties. Galveston county was also authorized to borrow additional money and could issue $20,000 worth of bonds.

be distributed by the county courts to the indigent families of soldiers. The financial agent of the penitentiary was instructed to divide the state into six districts and to make distribution to each district chosen by lot. The chief justices of each county were to supply lists of needy persons, and it was on the basis of this list that the quantity of cloth to be distributed was to be determined. The county courts, after having received their allotted share from the agent, could dispose of it directly to the needy at their own discretion. Accurate records were to be kept of the cloth distributed together with the prices paid and the names of recipients.

The law of November, 1864, repealed the two laws of January 1, 1862, and March 6, 1863, empowering the county courts to levy special taxes for the support of indigent soldiers' families. Since the laws of December 15, 16, 1863, were also repealed at the same time, it became necessary to institute another system to provide funds to care for the needy. The county courts were now authorized to levy and have collected a tax on all proper subjects of taxation by the state as rendered in their respective counties, including license taxes and those on merchandise. These taxes were in no case to exceed state taxes levied on similar subjects. Taxpayers were to have an opportunity to make payment either in cash or kind; the court was given the right to determine the monetary value of all items of prime necessity which were receivable for taxes. This valuation was to be made every three months. No property belonging to a soldier in service (except those at home on permanent detail) was to be sold for taxes under the provisions of this act as long as he remained in service.[9] At the second extra session a joint resolution of November 15 provided that all wool cards then in the hands of the Military Board were to be transferred to the various counties, at their expense, for free distribution among the indigent families of soldiers. All surplus cards were then to be sold and the proceeds given to the indigent family fund.[10] The system devised in Texas for the relief of the destitute families of soldiers was now completed, and no further changes were made during the duration of the war.

---

[9] *General Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas, Second Extra Session,* c. xii, 10–12. November 15, 1864. See also: *Ibid.,* c. xiii, 12–13. November 15, 1864. This amendment gave the counties ninety days to make application for the cloth; if they did not do so the surplus could be sold to the Confederate government. The acts of December 15, 16, 1863, were repealed by *Ibid.,* c. xiv, 13. November 15, 1864.

[10] *Special Laws of the Tenth Legislature of the State of Texas, Second Extra Session,* c. v, 16. November 16, 1864.

In Texas a system of county levies was eventually supplemented by the appropriation and distribution of $1,600,000 of state funds. This state appropriation, however, proved to be inadequate to meet the needs of the needy families, and it was eventually replaced in favor of a distribution of cloth from the state penitentiary. The county levies were increased substantially on three different occasions, and there was a tendency to substitute a distribution in kind for cash payments. Taxes in the counties were generally collected in articles of prime necessity. Although the situation became very critical in Texas, it never became necessary to resort to impressments or requisitions as it did in some other states.

Local and state appropriations and taxes did not solve the problem. Dishonesty on the part of officials and fraudulent claims by many families not really in need unquestionably siphoned off much money, but this was not the real trouble. There just was not enough goods to go around. Large quantities of the available supplies were taken by the Confederate agents collecting the tax in kind.[11] There was not enough goods to meet both the national and state needs, and the agents of the former took the disproportionate share. Increased taxes and appropriations did not solve the problem. Goods merely fell into the hands of speculators as prices rose, and some states tried to meet this by impressing goods. In Texas the legislature eventually shifted over to a distribution in kind in an effort to solve the problem, but actually its solution was beyond the power of the legislature to handle regardless of what measures might have been taken.

William Frank Zornow

Kansas State College

11 The tax in kind is described in John Schwab, *The Confederate States of America*, New York, 1904, 292–293, 298–299, 301–302.

Book Reviews

On the Nature of History. By James C. Malin. Distributed by the Author, Lawrence, Kansas, 1954. Pp. vii, 290. $3.00.

Acton on History. By Lionel Kochan. André Deutsch, London, 1954. Pp. 185. $3.00.

Professor Malin, of the University of Kansas, gives his lithoprinted book the accurate subtitle "Essays about history and dissidence," for this little volume is, in the main, a collection of essays in which the author offers vigorous, almost violent, expression to his disagreement with the historical approach of many historians of this generation. Five of the essays concentrate on the author's interest in this subject: "On the nature of history," "History in relation to the social thought of P. W. Bridgman," "History in relation to aspects of field theory," "Historians and geography" and "The problem of conservative and liberal traditions in the historiography of the United States: A plea for objectivity in history." Three essays deal with problems of special academic interest to the author. "From Missouri to Kansas: The case of H. Miles Moore 1852–1855" traces in fascinating detail Moore's political transformation in three years' time from a forceful pro-slavery Missourian to a free-state leader in Leavenworth, Kansas. "The nature of the American Civil War: The verdict of three Kansas democrats" presents, as a neglected hero, Samuel Medary who served as Governor of the Kansas Territory from 1858 to 1860, resigning from that office upon the news of Lincoln's election. Following his resignation, Medary founded a newspaper, *"The Crisis,"* where he argued, correctly according to Malin, that the approaching conflict was not irrepressible and that the Union's continuing solidarity did not depend upon the Federal Government's encroachment upon the inviolate sovereignty of each State. In contrast to Medary, Malin sorrowfully offers the careers of Benjamin F. Stringfellow and Samuel D. Lecompte who, in the immediate post-Civil War days, accepted the new order and deserted the state rights democrats to support, on the grounds of political expediency "the national unitary state" and Grant for President. In "The Wirt Case" the Kansas historian, in great anger, defends the memory of William A. Wirt (1874–1938), the famous Superintendent of Schools at Gary, Indiana, who in 1934 aroused a congressional and national storm when he attacked the New Deal Administration as the naive victim of a conspiratorial minority which was methodically planning the destruction of the American political and social order.

Of all the essays in this collection, the two on Kansas history are the best. The poorest papers are those attempting to discuss the canons of current historical practice. In these essays Professor Malin fails in that no idea is ever developed in thoroughness and in that, despite his impassioned

plea for objectivity, he seems incapable of keeping his own subjective views under reasonable restraint. A deplorable example of this is his evaluation of Vernon L. Parrington's *Main Currents of American Thought,* of which he says, "It belongs to the same class as Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in debasing history to the level of vicious propaganda in support of a social program being imposed upon a nation." The body of calm, serious literature depicting the limitations of Parrington's work is in striking contrast to Malin's intemperate and choleric criticism and points up the essential weakness of Malin's book, its complete lack of balance.

In his lifetime Lord Acton was a far more famous dissenter than Professor Malin. In Acton's case, the exquisite quality of his historical dissidence has earned him a continuing place in literature on the art of history. The present study endeavors to give clear expression to Acton's underlying historical attitude, taking the critical viewpoint that Acton's inner approach to history is the abiding feature of his work rather than his response to any particular historical period or personality. In his examination, the author draws heavily upon the now increasingly sifted notebooks of Acton in the University Library at Cambridge.

Kochan considers Acton's historical work as having been refracted through a unique prism of five faces. The first face is identified as Acton's great "sympathy" for the individuality of every epoch in history approached on its own terms. The second face is depicted as Acton's strict requirement that the historian discipline himself to possess an "external vision," the ability to view men and events from a moral position elevated by its conception of man. The third side of the prism through which Acton viewed history reflected his consciousness that in each historical moment there are constant elements, the irreducible forces at play in every historical situation. From this angle Action stressed the contemporaneity of history, revealed by such phenomena as the problem of power which is intrinsic to every historical plot. The eternal recurrence of the great themes in history did not, according to Kochan, make Acton a pessimist, for the fourth face of his prism reflected an historical world in which progress is a real possibility grounded in "the superiority of ethical motives over physical, of man over nature." The fifth face of Acton's prism reflects his insight into the task of the historian to teach and guide, moving always in this assignment from the real world toward the ideal in an analogous manner to the quest of the philosopher as conceived by Plato.

The result of Kochan's subtle approach to Acton is that, by the quality of his own historical imagination, he gives to Acton's basic historical thought a sense of completeness which was lacking from the historian's life-time of uncompleted work. To those receptive to Acton's charm as a man and as a historian, this book will be received as the best of the recent studies on him

EDWARD GARGAN

Loyola University, Chicago

Michigan In Four Centuries. By F. Clever Bald. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1954. Pp. xiii, 498.

This is the first production sponsored by the John M. Munson Michigan History Fund, administered by the Michigan Historical Commission. As is stated in the foreword, the bequest was made to publish "a history of the state and a history of education in Michigan." Members of the Commission have sought to offer "a history which would be as sound, complete and unbiased as human nature will permit, . . . directed to the adult as well as to youthful residents of the state." Indubitably this is a worthwhile objective, and one might well hesitate to offer any criticism of the results of such sincere effort.

By eliminating footnotes and reserving the mention of sources to a list of acknowledgments (pp. 481–494) the author succeeds in avoiding irksome monotony. The select list of books (pp. 477–481) will also supply the more avid reader with ample references. Moreover, the vocabulary has been "adjusted to the high school level," and some "chapters were tested" in classrooms. Such appeal to youthful readers justifies the inclusion of paleontology, geology, and prehistory. Besides offering a hint of the natural resources, these subjects stimulate interest by being linked to the present. These chapters are exceptionally well done.

Part II, a summary of the French and British episode, fully measures up to the Commission's ideal. It gives a complete yet concise account of the period in a lucid, lively style. Perhaps one with previous knowledge of the era might question the appraisal of a few characters, but such objection is readily overridden by the interest awakened.

In Part III there seems to be an attempt to eulogize. The memorandum of the United States surveyor general, Tiffin, is classified as "libel." Undoubtedly it was an "unfavorable report" and gave Michigan such "a bad reputation" that settlement in the southeastern sector was delayed. However, this criticism serves to enhance the consequent activities of Governor Cass. It would seem to be more than mere coincidence that evils of a situation are repeatedly deferred until they can be introduced as laudatory reforms. Since the book is intended to contribute to the formation of good citizenship, perhaps it is best to use this expedient rather than to excoriate a vice.

"Completeness" which is listed as a feature of this volume, is pursued to such an extent as to be almost exhaustive. In fact, the numerous listings of participants, especially in phases of industrial expansion, produce a crowding and a change of style in the latter half of the book. There are also several distracting elements which make a perusal somewhat laborious. *First,* almost exact duplication of previously expressed ideas, e.g., "A new state institution of higher learning, the Michigan Mining School, was established in 1886 at Houghton, in recognition of the need for trained mining engineers," (p. 308); "In 1886 the state opened a new institution of higher learning, the Michigan Mining School at Houghton in the Upper Peninsula" (p. 319). *Second,* very short paragraphs on diverse topics. This may be an attempt to imitate a journalistic style, but coherence is somewhat disturbed. Thus the same page (319) has seven paragraphs treating of labor, railroads, public schools, Michigan Mining School, public utilities, home architecture,

and the Republican party. The sentence quoted above constitutes one paragraph. *Third,* rhetorical unity of some grammatically correct sentences is slightly strained, e.g., "In Kalamazoo, Dr. William E. Upjohn began manufacturing pharmaceuticals, and the production of paper was becoming important." In themselves these are not serious defects, but their cumulative effect is annoying. Education is the only field that lacks a "complete" treatment. The limited space allotted to its treatment after 1870 is restricted to "public" institutions.

A. F. KUHN

University of Detroit

The History of St. Meinrad Archabbey. By Albert Kleber, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Indiana, 1954. Pp. xii, 540. $7.50.

St. Meinrad is a Benedictine abbey in Spencer County, Indiana. There for a century a family of monks have prayed and labored in a quiet seclusion traditional of the followers of St. Benedict. Its members have gone forth to administer parishes in Southern Indiana, to conduct missions among the Indians of the Northwest, and to establish new Benedictine foundations. The seminary has educated over seventeen hundred priests for various dioceses, among whom are twelve Bishops and one Archbishop. Of these accomplishments little was written, but with the event of St. Meinrad's centennial Father Kleber has published a needed history of the institution.

The author gathered his material from original sources, almost exclusively from the Abbey archives, and supplemented it with his personal experiences of sixty-two years as a Benedictine of St. Meinrad. He writes with surprising candor of the virtues and faults of the pioneers and founders of the abbey. He presents an informative account of the internal operations of a Benedictine monastery amplified with anecdotes, domestic affairs, and even legends. Father Kleber used good judgment in selecting quotations that allow the outsider an opportunity to know otherwise unobtainable documents. From the collection of illustrations, one may follow the Abbey's history in pictures.

In 1852, Father Joseph Kundek, agent for his Bishop Maurice de St. Palais of Vincennes, induced Abbot Henry Schmid at the Swiss monastery of Maria Einsiedeln to establish a daughter foundation in Indiana. Two "explorers," Fathers Ulrich Christen and Bede O'Connor, arrived in America the following year, decided on the site, and inaugurated the new mission house in March 1854, under the name and patronage of St. Meinrad, a ninth century Swiss Benedictine hermit and martyr.

The first years were so filled with discouragement that abandonment of the project was discussed continually. The unpromising situation was due to a number of factors, as unqualified superiors and rule by an Abbot in Switzerland. A turn for the better occurred with the appointment of Father Martin Marty as Visitator and Administrator. His vigorous direction

of the monastery restored confidence in the undertaking. The monastic school improved and parishes under the monks expanded.

By 1870, the daughter foundation of Maria Einsiedeln showed strength sufficient to seek independence; thus St. Meinrad became, in that year, an independent monastery with Father Martin Marty as the first Abbot. He held office until election of Fintan Mundwiler in 1880, who in turn was succeeded by Athansius Schmitt, 1898–1932. The present Abbot Ignatius Esser was chosen in 1932. Within the framework of the several Abbots, the history of the monastery continues, telling of building and re-building of the monastery, development of the Minor and Major Seminaries and establishment of new foundations. Under Abbot Fintan, St. Meinrad became head of the Swiss-American Congregation of Benedictines. It advanced to the honorary position of an Archabbey in 1953.

While in general the printing of this Book was well done, it is marred by a number of typographical errors that should have been detected by the proof reader.

It is hoped that the *History of St. Meinrad Archabbey* marks the auspicious beginning of studies concerned with American Benedictines. Perhaps a fitting sequel to this work would be the life and labors of Bishop Martin Marty.

The book should be of interest to the priest alumni, historians of American Church History and even students of American social and cultural history will find value and profit in reading it. While it is concerned primarily with the story of an institution, the account gives interesting side-lights on the nature of life in these United States, even in a monastery.

JOHN MENTAG

Loyola University, Chicago

History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century. By Sister M. Justille McDonald. Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1954. Pp. 324.

Marcus Lee Hansen in his book, *The Immigrant in American History,* points out that the immigrant as a significant force in the development of America has not as yet been fully investigated, and because of this, perhaps not accurately evaluated. The accomplishment of this task, Professor Hansen continues, requires the careful study of each nationality group in the United States, their distribution, and their ultimate influence upon the area in which they settled. The final evaluation in the last analysis awaits the publication of many studies by many historians in many areas, each investigating the local sources in order that the total picture be more complete and accurate.

It is in such a frame of reference that the doctoral dissertation of Sister M. Justille McDonald must be examined. Here is a specialized study in

local history which should be of interest to the student of American immigration. It is worthy of note for a number of reasons. First, because the author presents us with a readable, balanced, and temperate analysis of her subject on the basis of an exhaustive study of historical sources in Wisconsin and elsewhere. Secondly, because the author has delved deeply into a specialized form of local history without succumbing to the major pitfall of that type of investigation—antiquarianism. There is little here to satisfy the tastes of the genealogists or antiquarian as the author warns the reader in her Preface.

In treating her subject Sister M. Justille divides her work along the traditional lines of investigation. Beginning with an anaylsis of Irish emigration to America and their subsequent migration into the mid-West and Wisconsin, the author sets the stage upon which all future activity is predicated. Sister then proceeds to study the distribution and occupation of the Irish immigrant as he moved gradually into this rapidly developing area. With the marked decline in the flow of Irish immigrants into the state following the 1860's the study turns to an analysis of the Irish as they engaged in political, social, and religious activities in their new home. This latter portion of the dissertation, which occupies approximately half the book, shows the interests and objectives of the Irish as an immigrant group, acting for the most part as a single unit. In this half of her study Sister M. Justille is careful not to claim too much for the Irish and recognizes the greater influence of other immigrant groups, particularly the German, in the development of Wisconsin.

This recognition of the greater impact of other nationality groups upon the state's development leaves the author open to some criticism as her approach to the subject. Unlike the Irish Immigrant in many eastern states, the Irish in Wisconsin are of subordinate importance in the growth of that state during the nineteenth century. This fact does not mean that they are unworthy of investigation; but rather, that the treatment of such a less-significant immigrant group could be made historically more meaningful by a study which encompassed a larger geographical area. The story of the Irish in Wisconsin is not radically different from the history of the Irish immigrant in the neighboring states of the mid-West. Could not their influence in the mid-West—and in American History—be judged more accurately if artificial (in terms of any migratory movement into a given area) state boundaries were abandoned? The intensity of the author's research is commendable; but, even in a doctoral dissertation, there is a point of diminishing returns. Sister M. Justille has demonstrated much ability in her handling of this difficult subject; it seems unfortunate that she did not utilize it for a more meaningful local study of Irish immigration.

JOHN J. REARDON

Loyola University, Chicago

Champion of Reform Manuel Abad y Queipo. By Lillian Estelle Fisher. Library Publishers, New York, 1955. Pp. xi, 314. $6.

At long last this book has been published. Miss Fisher after her years of scholarly research and patient waiting to bring her findings to print has rewarded students of Spanish American history with an illuminating and mature study of Bishop Abad y Queipo and the period of the Mexican revolt from Spain. Very objectively and sympathetically she has woven a narrative almost completely from raw materials to present a clear record of a hitherto controversial figure. More, backed by her intimate knowledge of the times, she has brought forth a drama, almost a tragedy, whose hero is a distinguished prelate caught in the cross-currents of a great turning point in the history of nations. The figure of a forlorn, religious man, struggling for some secure harbor of political thought in the ebb tide of absolutism and the flood tide of radicalism, is remarkably vivid.

The life of Abad y Queipo, 1751–1825, spanned the French Revolution, the Napoleonic wars, and the emancipation of Americans from European motherlands. The natural son of a noble of the house of Abad in the Granadas Manuel studied at the University of Salamanca, was ordained priest, and was taken by the Archbishop of Guatemala to his New World See. In Guatemala, Abad y Queipo served well for five years until health required a change of climate. He went with the Bishop of Michoacán in 1805 to the salubrious city of Valladolid in New Spain. There, while employed chiefly in administrative tasks, his troubles began.

The chapters describing the prelate's position in relation to the people, the Church, and the government are done in fine detail from documents. First, he tried quietly to obtain from Rome papers legitimatizing his birth so that his influence among the people might not be impaired and his promotions might not be stopped. The word got abroad to his defamation. Yet, his religious principles and his pastoral work were beyond reproach. His loyalty to the Church and to the clergy, despite some unworthy men, was outstanding; he was a friend of the people, whether Spanish born, Creole, mestizo or Indian; he was a notable promoter of public works and public welfare. Even though, backed by loyal followers, he journeyed via the United States and had the stigma of his birth removed in Spain and his appointment as bishop-elect settled, still enemies pursued him to his dying day.

His political views are clearly expressed in his many writings. He was indeed a champion of reform of the Spanish government. He was against armed revolt, and in this position of reform and redress he was similar to John Adams. He proclaimed loudly against Napoleon and for a Ferdinand VII rather than for the Spanish Cortes; he vainly hoped that a non-absolutist Ferdinand VII might emerge. He was against the insurgents Hidalgo and Morelos for their militarism and lack of practical solutions to the many abuses. He held that sovereignty resided in the mass of people and through them in the State. But he argued that the Spanish State was not dissolved simply because Napoleon had taken the Peninsula and that the Americans were not automatically freed by the fact. His stand, of course, as a liberal and a conservative, and his efforts to prevent the revolu-

tions, well told by Miss Fisher in Chapters IX and X, got him into trouble with the insurgents, while some progressive cities named him their representative to the Spanish Cortes.

When Napoleon was put away in 1814 Ferdinand VII called him to Spain, where he had his appointment to the See of Michoacán first confirmed then done away with by the restored absolutist. Next, Abad y Queipo fell under the ban of the Inquisition. He was arrested in 1816 and confined as the trial dragged on through innumerable legalities. Protests came from Mexico, protests came from the prelate regarding the injustice of the procedures. Freed at first on earlier charges he was then honorably restored to his bishopric, but not allowed to return to it. The Bishop of Michoacán lived in Madrid until the fateful revolt of 1820 against Ferdinand VII's absolutism. The King allowed him to be a deputy at the congress, but when the absolutism reaction set in in 1823 had him arrested as disloyal and sent over the mountains to the monastery at Sisla where he died on September 15, 1825.

Miss Fisher concludes that Abad y Queipo was "a conscientious, cultured, and public-spirited churchman, a very loyal subject, yet a severe critic of all phases of administration in the decaying Spanish monarchy. He was also a progressive reformer, economist, and statesman working to uphold the tottering monarchy and for his beloved adopted country—New Spain." Her conclusions are amply justified by the weight of documentary evidence which she has so painstakingly gathered and assessed. The work may be considered as definitive.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

Notes and Comments

There's a Glory in the Name "Ohio"

Speak the word "Ohio" with reverence. It is a consecrated name. True, it was not always so; nor is it such today where our Christianity has not prevailed. Ohio soldiers are writing home from Japan of their wonderment when they hear, while walking the streets of Tokio or Kyoto, Japanese gentlemen saluting one another, saying "Ohio" very distinctly. They say "Ohio Gozaimasu" but the first word is unmistakably the name of our state. When asked for an explanation, the reply is that, like the American "Hello" it is meaningless; it is just an ancient friendly greeting; how it originated no one seems to know. Certainly this old pagan "Ohio" carries no consecration.

The term was equally pagan here in America until Saint Isaac Jogues baptized it. He found the word wandering as a waif along the banks of the rivers of New York State where he was a captive of the cruel Iroquois three hundred years ago. Savage as they were, these Indians had not lost all sense of the beautiful and whenever they came upon a scene of fascinating waterscape their delight broke out into an exclamation that Father Jogues wrote down as "O–io." (What he actually wrote was "O–io–*gue,*" which means "*at* the beautiful river.") There it is; philologists recognize this as the origin, "in written language" by a man whose name we know, of the name of one of America's great commonwealths. A Providence has brought the word, across the mountains to a permanent fastness, equally appropriately described as the "Beautiful River," O–io. Need it be pointed out that this writing, done by mangled hands that were before the next snowfall to be frozen in a martyr's death, was a baptism in blood, a singular consecration.

The originator of this claim for Father Jogues is not, as might be thought, some devotee of his, as John Gilmary Shea; or some enthusiast over the missions, as the Protestant Bishop of California, William Ingraham Kip, but the cold meticulously accurate author of the *Wilderness Trail,* Mr. Charles A. Hanna. His work is a heavily documented account of the spearhead of white civilization into the northern Trans-Alleghenies. Mr. Hanna first evidences for us that the Iroquoian "io" means beautiful or fine. Father

Potier, whose glossary of the Huron language was published by the Canadian government, gives the same definition. We stop to call attention to this agreement because the respectable *Ohio Archeological and Historical Review,* (XXIX, 456f) carried an article of more vehemence than argument that maintained that "Beautiful River" was exclusively a French not an Indian appellation.

The reference to Father Jogues (in the *Wilderness Trail* I, 293) reads as follows:

> The word *Ohio* was formerly applied by the Iroquois to a number of other rivers besides the one that bears that name today, and it is significant that anciently it was usually written with the locative suffix *ge* or *gue.* Father Jogues, the French Jesuit martyr-missionary, wrote in 1646, *Oi–o–gue,* as the Huron-Iroquoian name of the Hudson River, given him at Sarachtoga, with the connection, *at* the river.

Hanna goes right on and adds:

> "Ohioge" *at* the river; *"Ohioge–son,"* the length of the river, wrote Bruyas.

"Wrote Bruyas." Who was Bruyas? Twice in volume one and twice in volume two Hanna quotes Bruyas' definitions of Indian words, but with no further identification of the man. He has, however, pointed out the item that is pertinent to this study; namely that the *gue* attached to Iroquoian words merely means "at." It will be observed that Bruyas also inserts an "h" in Jogues' Oi–o, and there we have Ohio as so many millions of Americans have been writing it for three centuries without stopping to think why or when or by whom this particular combination of letters, rather than thousands of other groupings, came to be the designation of a great river and a great state.

Father James Bruyas, who wrote Ohio with an "h" (and who disposes of our difficulty about the annoying suffix *gue*) came to Canada in 1666 and from that date until his death in 1712 was probably the most conspicuous of all the Jesuit missionaries. Thomas Campbell, S.J., in his *Pioneer Priests* tells of his many distinctions; our only interest is in his writings. The references to him and his letters in the *Jesuit Relations* are interminable. His Mohawk Grammar has been printed by the University of the State of New York; his Mohawk Catechism was studied by Cotton Mather in Boston. But his Mohawk Roots, a sort of dictionary, remains in manuscript. It must have been here that Hanna found the items—our Ohio among them—that he adopts. As Bruyas' contribution had to be sought in a rare, and unpublished work, so, not Hanna's but our citation

above is from Jogues. Thwaites in his *Jesuit Relations* found only five letters of Jogues, and he has no definition of the word Ohio. Francis X. Talbot, S.J., in his *Saint Among Savages, The Life of Isaac Jogues* uses twenty-one letters of Jogues, who mentions Ohio several times and in one place gives its meaning: the "Beautiful River."

With Jogues and Bruyas, to make a perfect trilogy, Father Joseph de Bonnecamp, S.J., must be mentioned in connection with Ohio's genesis. Like Bruyas, he was filled with the spirit of Jogues when he volunteered for the perilous Celeron expedition that challenged both British and Indian attacks while circumnavigating, south, west, north and east of what is as near as possible the actual boundaries by water of the present state of Ohio. Father Bonnecamp's map of the journey appears in all the best illustrated histories of the state. Conspicuous among its several important features are the words "OHIO OU LA BELLE" written in large letters beginning near the site of the present Cincinnati and advancing against the downflow to the present Wheeling. In the *Journal of the American Philosophical Society* (new series IV, 369) we read: "it is to the Journals of Celeron and Bonnecamp that we owe our knowledge of this first recorded voyage down La Belle Rivière, and with this expedition of 1749 begins the authentic history of the Ohio River"; and, he might have added, of Ohio state.

No doubt Ohio's eight million religious-minded people and their friends, and especially the children in Ohio, will be gladdened, and the gaity of their future celebrations made more endearing and lasting through the consciousness in many minds, down long ages, of this initial consecration of the name of their state, their home.

LAURENCE J. KENNY, S.J.

St. Louis University

* * * *

Indiana University Press last year published *The Cross and The Sword,* a translation by Robert Graves of Manuel de Jesús Galván's *Enriquillo,* "a novel of ruthlessness and intrigue when greed followed in the wake of Columbus and the Indian fought for survival." The original work of the Santo Domingo savant was published in part in 1879 and complete in 1882 in Spanish, while the edition used

in this translation is that of 1894. This is one of the UNESCO Collection of Representative Works: Latin American Series, published with the cooperation of the Organization of American States. Written in the spirit and after the pattern of our *Last of the Mohicans,* this Indianist story exhalts the noble Indian chief and illustrates the "Black Legend" of Spanish cruelty. Much lore of the sixteenth century West Indian scene is brought into the novel and almost every historical figure is set in place. Looming large is Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas. Some of the dialogue and descriptions are taken directly from historical documents. The translation is in highly polished and rather stilted English, but its literary qualities are apparent. The price is $3.75.

* * * *

University of Minnesota Press this past February brought out *Red Scare, A Study in National Hysteria, 1919–1920,* by Robert K. Murray, in 337 pages including bibliography, source materials, and an index. Professor Murray of Pennsylvania State College has done an excellent work of planning his monograph and presenting the many and complex threads of his story in an interesting style. His introductory chapter sets the scene for the great fear of radiaclism after World War I and his second chapter introduces the chief radicals. The body of the book, fourteen chapters, is a detailed summary of the hysteria in the country, leading to the formation of the Americanism societies in the face of intolerance, riots, bombings, strikes, federal and state raids, and arrests and trials of radicals. The last chapter is an analysis of the dangers of an hysteria caused by fears of communism. The Red Scare of that time persists in the thoughts of Americans of today who in most cases never heard of what happened in 1919–1920. There is far more danger at present from communism, but hysterical action is not recommended by Mr. Murray as a proper defense.

* * * *

The history of a newspaper generally is of local interest, but the story of *The Raleigh Register 1799–1863* as told by Robert Neal Elliott, Jr., deserves wide comment. The book is Volume 36 of The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, published under the direction of the Departments of History and Political

Science of the University of North Carolina. The book in the customary paper binding of the Studies is of 133 pages including a source bibliography and an index. Mr. Elliott makes his scholarly study a biography of the newspaper and its chief helmsmen the Gales, father and son, whose influence on national questions was widespread.

* * * *

The government of the Catholic Church in Milwaukee was in the hands of four prelates whose terms spanned the years between 1843 and 1930. Biographical sketches of three of these churchmen have been brought together in the recently published *Three Archbishops,* by The Reverend Benjamin J. Blied, Ph.D. The Archbishops are Michael Heiss who died in 1890, Frederick Katzer who died in 1903 and Sebastian Messmer. Father Bleid presents his subjects in an entertaining and understanding manner in the paper bound book of 160 pages, and he has not only estimated their achievement clearly in a brief compass but he has outlined a general history of the Church, particularly in its educational aspects, from the time of Wisconsin statehood to the beginning of the national depression. He has been rather careful too to avoid ruralizing his studies by indicating the significance of these churchmen in the national and international affairs.

* * * *

The story of the development of the oil industry in a locality, a state, or in a country has regularly appeared in print, but rarely with the scholarship and conciseness found in *Petroleum in Venezuela, A History,* by Edwin Lieuwen. This paper-bound volume of 160 pages was published last year by the University of California Press, taking its place on the shelf as Volume 47 of the University of California Publications in History. Running through this record of the petroleum developments that brought a backward Venezuela from rags to riches, at least as far as the national bank account is concerned, is the theme of exploitation by Juan Vicente Gómez, the President and chief concession distributor from 1909 to 1935.

This year the same University of California Publications has added Volume 48 to its list. This is *The Point Loma Community in California, 1897–1942, A Thosophist Experiment,* by Emmett A. Greenwalt. In eighteen chapters Mr. Greenwalt traces the origins

and objectives of the Theosophical Society from the time in 1877 when Madame Blavatsky became the vehicle whereby her god Isis unveiled himself long enough to urge the world to get rid of material science and Christianity, on through the building of the remarkable halls of the cult at Point Loma and their control by Katherine Tingley. The spectacular "by-products" of the community, music, dance, and drama, its pamphlets and books, its reform movements, each brought in support money, until the inevitable mismanagement set in which terminated the experiment of an agricultural Eden and an industrial paradise.

Both volumes are at editorial par, with indexes and bibliographies.

* * * *

The artistically illustrated *Texas Sketchbook,* revised edition, is being distributed by Humble Oil and Refining Company of Texas. The writer, F. T. Fields and the illustrator E. M. Schiwetz, give a fine example of visualizing the chief scenes of the major historical events in the life of Texas. The printer has aided the artist and narrator with a master's format, presenting the cover and a number of the Schiwetz paintings and drawings in color. There are some historical inaccuracies in the text, which will probably be overlooked by general readers.

* * * *

Texas was invaded by a Mexican force in 1842, captured San Antonio de Béxar and fifty-six citizens of the Lone Star Republic with their flag, and went home, all within the month's time allowed by Santa Anna who was far from the scene. The event was reported by the leader of the troops, Woll, and the report was published in Monterrey shortly after the conquering heroes returned. It has now been translated and edited by Joseph Milton Nance and is published in *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* of April, 1955, as "Brigadier General Adrian Woll's Report of his Expedition into Texas in 1842". Why this "army" of 668 cavalry soldiers, 217 officers, and a band of thirty-seven musicians made the sortie is not clear. Amusing items, besides the proportion of three men to an officer, appear in the account, especially the scarcity of ammunition—not three musket balls per man! The significance of this move on the part of Santa Anna is not pointed out. Could it be

that by it the slippery mind of the dictator thought he had established a claim to Texas which led him in the following year to declare that if the United States annexed Texas the act would be a declaration of war?

* * * *

The state of the age old problem of Vespucci's voyage is brought up to date by Vicente A. Cerni in the October, 1954, number of *Estudios Americanos* the Revista de la Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, Sevilla, Spain. This review of the recent literature on Vespucci is timely and may be considered as commemorative of 1454, the year of the Florentine's birth. Dr. Cerni points out a program which may help to solve the problem, whether the voyage was made or not. In the November-December number of this periodical Jaime Delgado has an interesting study of "La Revolutión Mejicana," placing its causes not so much in the political events involving President Woodrow Wilson with Huerta and Carranza, as in the poverty of the *peones.*

Another problem has been the final resting place of the bones of Columbus. A lengthy discussion of the evidence appears in the *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* X, 1953, recently published. The article "Los Restos de Cristóbal Colon en Sevilla," by Professor Manuel Giménez Fernández, backed by twenty pages of documents, concludes, pages 146 and 150, that Columbus died in Valladolid on June 20, 1508, and his bones were translated to the Crypt of the Chapel of Santa Ana de la Cartuja de las Cuevas outside Seville on April 11, 1509, where they remain to the present day. There is no evidence to show that the bones of the Admiral were moved to the Cathedral of Santo Domingo, but medical evidence seems to indicate clearly that the remains in the Cathedral are those of somebody else, possibly Bishop Alexandro Geraldini, second prelate of Santo Domingo.

* * * *

Usually attractive is the format of *Nebraska History* for March, 1955. The cover is a photograph of the spire of Chimney Rock and the article "Chimney Rock on the Oregon Trail" is happily illustrated with sketches of the landmark made by travelers from 1830 and 1874. Merrill J. Mattes, the author, concludes his study with a compilation of descriptions quoted directly from the writ-

ings of the early observers of the curiosity and with a long bibliography. The concluding pages of this number are devoted to the pioneer educator "Joseph G. Masters, 1873–1954." The appreciation is by his widow Helen Geneva Masters.

* * * *

The greater part of *West Virginia History,* April, 1955, is taken up with "Berkeley County in World War II," by Patricia W. Alger. How men and women of the County participated in the Military, on the home front, in industry, is an interesting story, and it is followed by lists and tables illustrating the fine contribution to the war effort.

* * * *

Alexander Hamilton is the subject of seven studies in *The William and Mary Quarterly* of April 1955. The editors have named this the Alexander Bicentennial Number. The titles of the studies are: "Life Portraits of Alexander Hamilton," well illustrated and described by Harry MacNeill Bland and Virginia W. Northcott; "Hamilton's Quarrel with Washington, 1781," by Broadus Mitchell, and "The Origins of the American Party System," by Joseph Charles, throw more light on the relations of Hamilton and Washington. "Hamilton on the Louisiana Purchase: A Newly Identified Editorial from the *New York Evening Post,*" "A Note on Certain of Hamilton's Pseudonyms," and "What Was Hamilton's 'Favorite Song'," have the touch of the Editor. Concluding the symposium is the interesting question and answer, "Was Hamilton a Christian Statesman," by the Editor, Douglas Adair and Marvin Harvey.

* * * *

A confrere, a student of military aspects of the Confederacy, is rather enthusiastic about two short books published in late 1954. One is *Columbus, Georgia, in the Confederacy,* by Diffee William Standard, Head of the English Department of Tennessee Military Institute, published by the William-Frederick Press, New York, in a neat paper cover in seventy-seven pages including the bibliography. This is an example of the best historical method applied to a very limited area for a limited time. The book is not small in value because it is a picture of the social and industrial life of the Chat-

tahoochee River port during the Civil War which brings out more clearly the actual life and thinking of the people behind the lines than can be gathered from more general histories. The minute and detailed documents reveal surprisingly that the people of the port lived better, produced better, and supported the war effort better than has been thought. Columbus and the river boats were of great aid in the pre-railroad days and the Chattahoochee became a source of riches, since it was not cut off from commerce and industry. The book should be of interest to the soldiers at Fort Benning, the largest infantry camp in America, close to Columbus and in the heart of the region described.

The second book is a fine edition of *Stonewall Jackson and the Old Stonewall Brigade,* by John Esten Cooke, edited by Richard Barksdale Harwell, and published by University of Virginia Press for The Tracy W. McGregor Library. This is an edition of the first biography of Jackson and the only extensive account written before his death in battle. Valuable as a work of artistic printing and the many details of the hero's life, its real value to the historian lies in the view it gives of the emotional and idealistic mind of the Southern writer and reader. As a biography and polemic it symbolizes in Jackson the glory and indestructibility of the Southern cause. It reveals how people felt at the time rather than how they are made to feel by the organized propaganda of today. It was the positive approach to building their leaders into heroes, which is so much more difficult to achieve in the present era of criticism of national figures and debunking techniques. Cooke's biography runs for forty pages of beautiful typesetting and another forty pages are occupied with the editor's study of Cooke, a bibliography, and an index.

* * * *

January 1, 1955, the name of *The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* was changed to *The Ohio Historical Quarterly.* The new format of the sixty-four year old magazine is entirely pleasing.

The Louisiana Historical Quarterly for January 1955, under its new Editor, Joseph G. Tregle, of Loyola University, New Orleans, also adopted a bright new form. It is cheering to know that the back numbers from 1952 are being published and that the gap between volume XXXV and the present XXXVIII will be filled.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 37, NUMBER 4 OCTOBER 1955

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1955

VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

THE ENLISTED SOLDIER AT THE FRONTIER POST, 1790–1814 . . *Norman W. Caldwell* 195

CATHOLIC PRESS REACTION TO THE CUSTER DISASTER . . . . . *Marie Louise Schulte* 205

CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND THE POLICIES OF JAMES II. . . *Bernard Norling* 215

FATHER PIRET LANDS IN NEW YORK, 1846—DOCUMENT . . . . . *Alexis A. Praus* 229

BOOK REVIEWS 236

NOTES AND COMMENTS 241

INDEX FOR VOLUME XXXVII 244

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS
RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, $2.00; in foreign countries, $2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1955

VOLUME 37 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 26 NUMBER 4

The Enlisted Soldier at the Frontier Post, 1790-1814

At the bottom of the military hierarchy stood the common soldier. The regular army of the period was founded upon voluntary enlistment and represented quite a different type of personnel from that which makes up the present-day armed forces, which are based upon the military draft supplemented by voluntary enlistment. Since military service was then relatively less attractive than it is now, recruiting activities occupied an important place in the military organization and in some cases came to be a major operation at the frontier post.[1]

A recruiting detail generally included the familiar sergeants and musicians and sometimes a commissioned officer.[2] The payment

Editor's Note: This study was made possible, in part, by research grants from Southern Illinois University.

[1] Detailed researches on Fort Massac in Southern Illinois reveal that this post almost continually had some men on recruiting detail. See, for example, Secretary of War to General Wilkinson, 2 December, 1808, War Office, Military Book, III, 456. At this time Fort Massac was designated as a receiving center for western recruits. See also Inspector General to Major William McRea, 4 May, 1805, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, 12 February, 1805–4 September, 1809, unnumbered pages; General Orders, 7 April, 1806, Wilkinson Order Book, 581; Inspector General to Captain D. Bissell, 18 January, 1803, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, September, 1800–April, 1803, 402; same to Daniel Vertner, 18 January, 1803, *ibid.*, 404. Unless otherwise stated references to manuscript materials used in this article are to materials found in the files of WD, AGO, the National Archives.

[2] Inspector General to Major William McRea, 4 May, 1805, *loc. cit.* This letter mentions "Officers, non Commissioned Officers and Musicians." General Wilkinson in 1805 mentions sending a detail to Tennessee consisting of officers "with music and Sergeants." Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 December, 1805, in C. E. Carter (ed.), *Territorial Papers of the United States*, 20 vols., Washington, 1934–1954, XIII, 298. Again we find a detail being sent from Fort Adams in 1808 composed of two captains, three lieutenants, and "such non Commissioned officers and musicians as

of bounties to encourage enlistment was of course necessary, these sums amounting to as much as sixty dollars according to a recommendation of General Wilkinson in 1805. It should be pointed out that such a bounty was equivalent to a year's pay for the recruit.[3] Little has been found concerning recruiting methods used in this period, but these probably were not greatly different from the traditional ones built around music and the bounty. American juries, however, would generally release a man who had been forced to enlist or who had been enlisted while drunk.[4] Evidently civilian agents were also used in the recruiting program; these persons were paid for each recruit brought in.[5]

Many recruits were enlisted in Tennessee and Kentucky; others came in on assignment from the eastern areas. The system was doubtless capable of drawing personnel from various walks of life as well as from foreign countries. Men of French, British, and Spanish blood mingled with farm boys from the frontier, though American-born men doubtless predominated.[6]

The pay of enlisted men in the period under consideration compared favorably with that of foreign armies.[7] The ordinary pay of the troops was increased when extra duty was required of the personnel, particularly if the duty involved physical labor such as

---

may be assigned to them...." District Orders, Columbian Spring, 29 September, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, no pagination.

[3] Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 December, 1805, *loc. cit.*

[4] William N. Blane, *An Excursion Through the United States and Canada during the Years 1822–23,* London, 1824, 381. Blane has a valuable chapter on the American Army, pp. 377 ff. A general court martial held at Cantonment Washington in November, 1810, heard the case of Lieutenant John Davis who was charged, among other things, with using threats, confinement, and other unfair means to force certain individuals to enlist in the army. The lieutenant was freed on a technicality. General Orders, New Orleans, 6 July, 1811, in Orders, Baton Rouge, no pagination.

[5] Captain Z. M. Pike relates how a half-breed Chickasaw appeared at Fort Pickering in 1799 with two enlistees. "...He made a charge of forty Dollars I thought it advisable to order him three Gallons of Public whiskey & pay him Cash twelve dollars & ninety four cents...." Pike to Cushing, 13 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 49–50.

[6] See Amos Stoddard, *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive of Louisiana,* Philadelphia, 1812, 91. Cuming tells of meeting a handsome sentinel at Fort Pickering who had deserted a French ship commanded by Jerome Bonaparte. *Cuming's Tour* in R. G. Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels,* IV, Cleveland, 1904, 294. Many of Major Doyle's men at Fort Massac were British deserters. Doyle to Wayne, 3 July, 1794, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Cited hereafter as "HSP."

[7] Blane considered the American troops well paid. *An Excursion,* 379. The pay scale of 1807 provided for the following monthly rates: sergeants, $10, corporals, $8, musicians, $8, and privates, $7. "Estimate of the expenses of a Regiment of infantry, per annum..., 1807," *American State Papers, Military Affairs,* I, 225. Cited hereafter as "ASP."

construction work. Thus Colonel Thomas Butler was ordered to allow extra pay of ten to fifteen cents to the troops assigned to work on the Natchez-Nashville pike in 1802.[8] It is not clear whether "haying," i.e., the gathering of forage for military horses and other animals kept at the post, was considered "extra duty."[9] "Haying" should be distinguished from "cropping," which refers to the soldiers tilling crops about the post for their own profit.[10] Pensions were paid only to men disabled in the service.[11]

The common soldier was reasonably well-clothed. In 1804 the secretary of war expressed concern about the quality of the uniforms issued to the men, stating that in his opinion it was better "to err in favor of the Soldier than against him. . . ."[12] Later it was estimated that the cost of clothing a common soldier for one year was approximately thirty-four dollars.[13] Sometimes the western soldier found himself without the necessary clothing or was forced to accept clothing intended for another branch of the service.[14] Too,

[8] Secretary of War to Lt. Col. Butler, 16 April, 1802, War Office, Military Book, 1800–1803, 192–193; same to Archibald Roan, 18 July, 1803, *ibid.*, 513–514. In 1802 the Secretary of War ordered that soldiers detailed for work on a house to be used by the Indian agency at Fort Wayne should each receive "15 Cents and one Gill of Spirits extra for every days work actually performed." Secretary of War to Thomas Pasteur, 4 June, 1802, Carter, VII, 52. In 1807 ten cents per day was paid for similar work done at Chicago (Fort Dearborn) and other northwestern posts. John Mason to Secretary of War, 13 May, 1809, Carter, XIV, 274.

[9] For references to "haying" see Doyle to Wayne, 26 February, 1794; Wayne to Doyle, 4 March, 1794; Doyle to Wayne, 12 March, 1794, all in HSP; Captain E. B. Clemson to D. Bissell, 22 July, 1812, inclosure, Bissell to Secretary of War, 7 August, 1812, Carter, XIV, 586.

[10] This was forbidden by a general order of 12 June, 1797. Wilkinson Order Book, 95. Soldiers also occasionally bred livestock and did labor for civilians. General Orders, Headquarters, Washington, D. C., 12 July, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, no pagination.

[11] Secretary of War to William Clark, 7 August, 1809, Carter, XIV, 290; Postmaster General to George Poindexter, 8 December, 1809, *ibid.*, VI, 34.

[12] Secretary of War to Tench Coxe, 21 January, 1804, War Office, Military Book, 17 November, 1803–28 February, 1807, 33.

[13] The exact figures were $34.07¾ for an infantry private and $34.41 for an artillery private. Rules and Regulations for the Army for 1803, Clothing, ASP, *Mil. Aff.*, I, 436–437.

[14] Clothing was especially scarce in 1799 since importers of cloth could not supply the contractors. Extract of a Letter from the Secretary of War, 10 July, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 16–17; Pike to Cushing, 13 October, 1799, *ibid.*, 48–49; Captain P. Pasteur to Cushing, 12 August, 1799, *ibid.*, 38. Wilkinson tells of recruits in 1805 who were "so raged & naked, . . . that I considered it a duty to appropriate . . . Artillery Cloathing for a Company . . . which had been lodged for the recruiting service." Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 15 June, 1805, Carter, XIII, 135–136. In 1809 the Inspector General ordered Colonel Thomas Butler to clothe his musicians with ordinary infantrymen's coats. Inspector General to Butler, 8 December, 1809, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, 4 September, 1809–7 March, 1811, 60.

clothing might arrive in damaged condition, as was the case in 1805 and 1806 when consignments of clothing were sunk in passing the Falls at Louisville.[15] In war time these inconveniences were necessarily more serious and aggravated. In 1813 a Quartermaster's Department was established to alleviate such problems.[16] One instance has been found in which enlisted men were provided blankets only after they had agreed to pay for them should the purchase not be approved by the War Department.[17]

Tailoring and fitting of uniforms was done generally by two tailors detailed from each company.[18] At Baton Rouge in 1811 a staff meeting of officers discussed problems pertaining to tailoring.[19] Evidently the uniforms of private soldiers were not always standard, either in style or color. Commanding officers had power to prescribe details concerning the uniforms worn by their organizations.[20]

Little has been found concerning the living quarters of the soldier at the frontier post. Except at New Orleans where the French barracks remained, little mention is made of brick or stone housing.[21] In 1805 the secretary of war authorized the erection of brick barracks

---

15 Wilkinson to Secretary of War, 10 December, 1805, Carter, XIII, 299; Major Bruff to Wilkinson, 12 March, 1805, *ibid.*, 103; John B. Treat to William Davy, 25 August, 1805, *ibid.*, 191–192; Secretary of War to Tench Coxe, 6 November, 1806, War Office, Military Book, 17 November, 1803–28 February, 1807, 529.

16 For shortages of clothing and other equipment among the troops of the Twenty-Fourth Regiment of Infantry, assembled at Fort Massac in 1813, see Norman W. Caldwell, "Fort Massac: Since 1805," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XLIV, No. 1, 56–57. See also Governor Howard to Secretary of War, 6 March, 1813, Carter, XIV, 641. Writing in 1814 Colonel William Russell said that the quartermaster's office at St. Louis was "very burthrensom [sic] to the government, and [I] hope after this business is settled, to have it in my power to cartail [sic] that expense very much." Russell to Secretary of War, 20 October, 1814, Carter, XIV, 796.

17 Governor Holmes to General Wilkinson, 19 October, 1812, Carter, VI, 329. Holmes had purchased the blankets on his own authority. These had been delivered to the men "upon condition that if the Government requires it, the Cost shall be deducted out of their pay."

18 See Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 6, 9 October, 1810, no pagination; Orders, Baton Rouge, 1 March, 13 April, 1811, no pagination.

19 Orders, Baton Rouge, 15, 18 March, 1811, no pagination.

20 Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 13 August, 1810, no pagination; *ibid.*, 23 August, 1810, no pagination. In 1799 Captain B. Shamburgh at Fort Stoddert reported that woollen overalls of all colors had been sent to his post, resulting in the men being clothed rather "Fantastically." Shamburgh to Cushing, 20 October, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 59–60.

21 The New Orleans barracks were used by American troops in the period under consideration. See Stoddard, *Sketches*, 154; also Zadok Cramer, *The Navigator; Containing Directions for Navigating the Monongahela, Allegheny, Ohio and Mississippi Rivers*, Pittsburgh, 1814, 317 (appendix), citing Stoddard. 1500 men could be housed at the New Orleans barracks.

at Detroit, provided bricks could be manufactured locally, but it is not clear whether these were actually built.[22] At the smaller posts, however, and in temporary quarters, the common soldier lived in log hutments or other improvised structures. Generally speaking, he was probably not well-housed. "Police" details in each hut or barracks room cooked the provisions and kept the room in order. Evidently only two meals per day were provided—at 8:15 a.m. and 12:20 p.m. at Cantonment Washington. Sometimes there were no mess tables, a deficiency which one officer sought to eradicate.[23] Then, as in the army of today, one meets with petty irregularities in the barracks. Some of these mentioned were sticking candles against the walls and throwing old clothing on the roofs.[24]

The problem of "passes" is also frequently met, especially in posts near larger civilian communities.[25] Soldiers going to Natchez in 1799 were ordered to be "clean shaved, dressed, and powdered."[26] Inspections and drills were held on Sundays, as a rule.[27] No evidence

---

22 The barracks mentioned in this case were strikingly similar to those of present-day construction. Each barracks was to be 20 feet by 62 feet and was to be partitioned into four rooms in the main or first storey, each room to be heated by a large fireplace. The half-storey above was a single room for sleeping quarters. Two windows of twenty panes of 7 inch by 9 inch glass were to be provided for each of the rooms below. Windows for the half-storey were to contain twelve panes of like glass. Along the front of each building was to be a piazza seven feet wide with a gravelled floor and benches against the wall. The buildings, if of wood, were to be painted brown, trimmed in white. Officers' barracks were to be of similar construction with some variations in internal arrangement. Secretary of War to Samuel T. Dyson, 5 August, 1805, Carter, X, 26. Many officers, no doubt, had their own dwelling houses, sometimes outside the fort as Captain Bissell did at Fort Massac. Cuming in *loc. cit.*, 277. Evans found a colonel at Niagara in 1818 living in some style with a parlor and servant. Estwick Evans, *A Pedestrious Tour, of Four Thousand Miles, Through the Western States and Territories, During the Winter and Spring of 1818,* in Thwaites, *Early Western Travels,* VIII, 165–166.

23 Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 19 July, 20 August, 1810, no pagination.

24 *Ibid.*, 19 November, 1810, no pagination.

25 Company orders at Baton Rouge in 1811 complained of the excessive number of passes given non-commissioned personnel, who thus neglected their duties in the barracks. Orders, Baton Rouge, 12 April, 1811, no pagination.

26 Cushing to Captain John Wade, 1 November, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 82. On the occasion of the death of General Washington, general passes were issued to such troops at Fort Adams "who can appear clean & well dress'd to join the civilians at Natchez in the memorial services." Music was also to be furnished by the troops. Same to same, 18 February, 1800, *ibid.*, 125.

27 See Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 11 September, 1810, no pagination. No regular chaplains were provided except for higher commands. The Articles of War recommended attendance at divine services, forbade swearing, and penalized chaplains who did not do their duties. See Articles II, III, and IV, in Alexander Macomb, *A Treatise on Martial Law and Courts Martial; as practiced in the United States of America,* Charleston, 1809, 197 ff.

has been found of organized games or activities among the men, unless a reference to the distribution of extra liquor to an entire company at Baton Rouge may indicate some kind of intra-mural contests as being held.[28] Many references are found to card playing and a single order issued against "the odius [sic] and Cruel practice of Cock Fighting . . . ," indicates that the men had certain other forms of entertainment.[29]

Much could be written concerning discipline in the regular army during the period under consideration. By all accounts discipline would seem to have been much more harsh than that in current practice in the national armed forces. Flogging and branding were still used as disciplinary measures, though the latter was limited to special cases.[30] In addition to the harshness of the punishments, there was a deliberate policy of frightening the convict, even if he had been pardoned. Thus a man sentenced to death in 1806 was to have his pardon read to him only after he was "brought under the Gallows. . . ."[31]

Post records reveal an astonishing number of disciplinary cases. At Cantonment Washington in 1810–1811, where some dozen companies of men were stationed, a regimental court met almost daily, the firing of a cannon announcing its sitting.[32] Offenses tried ranged through a long list, among which were drunkenness, unauthorized absences, disobedience of orders, neglect of duty, rioting and dueling, stealing, wife beating, gambling, lewdness in the

---

[28] Orders, Baton Rouge, 7 April, 1811, no pagination.

[29] Garrison Orders, Fort Adams, 23 February, 1808, no pagination.

[30] A few examples of sentences taken from general courts martial cases may be cited. For ordinary desertion, 100 lashes; for sleeping on guard, 100 lashes; for theft of a blanket, 50 lashes; for threatening the life of an officer, 100 lashes; for striking a non-commissioned officer, 100 lashes. Wilkinson Order Book, various orders, 1798, 135–138, 154–155, 140–141. A deserter who reenlisted was sentenced to receive 50 lashes and to be branded in the forehead with the letter "D" and to be "drummed" out of the service. The man sentenced was an old offender. General Orders, 4 January, 1807, *ibid.*, 670–671. A horse thief was sentenced to receive 100 lashes and to be put to hard labor with a 5½ inch shell loaded with lead chained to one foot. His head and one eyebrow were to be shaved and, upon the expiration of his enlistment, he was to be "drummed" out of camp. Four-fifths of the man's pay was to be forfeited to the local Indian agent. General Orders, 16 July, 1802, *ibid.*, 392–393. In 1806 the maximum number of lashes which could be given was reduced to 50. Art. LXXXVII, Articles of War, in Macomb, 243.

[31] Secretary of War to Col. Constant Freeman, 24 November, 1806, War Office, Military Book, III, 98.

[32] Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 19 September, 1810; *ibid.*, 17 April, 1811, no pagination.

barracks ("great habits of indecency"), cheating a civilian, and fighting.[33] More severe punishments were dealt out for stealing the effects of a dead officer, mayhem, extreme wife beating, stabbing a fellow soldier, and neglect of a loaded musket.[34]

The widespread prevalence of drunkenness deserves special attention. It was the opinion of Lieutenant Colonel Zebulon Montgomery Pike that drunkenness among the troops in both the American and British armies was at that time a national disgrace and he attributed to it half the diseases and deaths of the army.[35] Many intoxicated men were committed to the "black hole" by company commanders without trial for a short period, while corps commanders might so commit a person for up to forty-eight hours.[36] Chronic drunkards might be given as many as fifty lashes with "wired Catts."[37] In spite of severe punishments, however, drunkenness remained the most frequent offense coming to the attention of courts martial. Not only was liquor issued in the daily ration, it was also offered in extra amounts on special occasions.[38] Other means by which the soldier might procure extra liquor were through

---

[33] See especially Orders, Cantonment Washington, various dates. Sentences for these offenses were from ten to thirty lashes, variations being solitary confinement and denial of privileges.

[34] Garrison Orders, Fort Adams, 18 November, 1807, 12 February, 1808, 9 April, 1808, no pagination; Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 2, 3 October, 1810, and 27 August, 1810, no pagination. Such offenses carried penalties of up to 50 lashes or solitary confinement in the "black hole" for as long as one month in extreme cases. Men in the "black hole," however, could be released on order of the commanding officer. Orders, Cantonment Washington, 7, 24 October, 1810, no pagination.

[35] Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 16 August, 1810, no pagination. See also Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 18 March, 1811, no pagination. Here Pike states that intoxication "has been the Cause of the death of many of our [otherwise] Valuable Soldiers. . . ." Amos Stoddard gives the classic explanation of why drunkenness was so common. He writes, "One has the gout, and stimulating potions will drive it away. A second is cold, and they will warm him. A third is warm, and they will cool him. A fourth is disturbed in his mind, and they will obliterate his cares. A fifth complains of the foulness of the water, and they will purify it. A sixth, from long habit, has become habituated to them, and they alone will steady his nerves, and keep him in an equilibrious state." Stoddard doubted that any measures would lessen the evil. *Sketches*, 305–306.

[36] Orders, Baton Rouge, 4 March, 1811, no pagination.

[37] *Ibid.*, 4 April, 1811, no pagination. Severe sentences were also meted out to men found drunk on guard. Orders, Cantonment Washington, 30 July, 1810, no pagination.

[38] "As tomorrow is imphatically [sic] the birthday of our Country, each Soldier will Receive one Gill of extra whiskey at 12 O'clock. . . ." Garrison Orders, Fort Dearborn (near Natchez), 3 July, 1808, in Orders, Fort Adams, no pagination.

purchase from his comrades and from private liquor dealers, authorized or unauthorized.[39]

Desertion was also very common and, in spite of the heavy penalties assessed, there were so many offenders that blanket pardons for the offense were issued in 1807 and again in 1810.[40] Desertions were most common in posts adjacent to foreign territory or to Indian nations.[41] Desertions were also heavy during campaigns. General St. Clair's army lost about fifteen per cent of its strength in marching from Reading to Fort Pitt in 1792.[42] The deserters not only weakened the military strength of the frontier armed force, but they sometimes added their numbers to the ranks of the enemy, especially when they joined the Indians.[43] Unenviable, indeed, was the position of the frontier officer, who, in the face of increasing danger from enemies, could only watch his small force decline steadily in numbers through desertion, death, or discharge.[44]

---

[39] See Garrison Orders, Cantonment Washington, 9 August, 1810, no pagination. A camp follower who sold liquor to the troops "at the bake house" at Cantonment Washington in 1810 was sentenced to the "black hole." *Ibid.*, 24 October, 1810, no pagination.

[40] Inspector General to All Commanding Officers, 3 February, 1810, Inspector's Office, Letters Sent, 4 September, 1809–7 March, 1811, 92–93; Presidential Proclamations, 15 October, 1807, 20 January, 1810, War Office, Military Book, III, 225; *ibid.*, IV, 269. See also Regimental Orders, Columbian Spring, 20 November, 1807, in Orders, Fort Adams, no pagination; Orders, Baton Rouge, 1 April, 1811, no pagination. The common deserter got at least 50 lashes, while old offenders sometimes received more. Captain Shamburgh tells of old offenders at Fort Stoddert running the gauntlet eighteen times! Shamburgh to Cushing, 31 August, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Received, 39; Orders, Cantonment Washington, 30 August, 1810, no pagination. An old offender at Cantonment Washington was ordered to have his head half-shaved, to run the gauntlet three times, to make up his time lost by desertion, and to serve the remainder of his time in ball and chain. The reviewing officer remitted the gauntlet running. Orders, Cantonment Washington, 6 September, 1810, no pagination.

[41] For a discussion of desertion at Fort Massac, see Pike to Wayne, 6 August, 1796; Pike to Wayne and Wilkinson, 12 April, 1796, both in HSP. Pike was losing an average of a man per month at Fort Massac at that time. Major Doyle explained the heavy desertions in that many of the men were former British deserters who had enlisted in the American forces and who were thus already experienced in the business. Doyle to Wayne, 3 July, 1794, HSP. In 1799 Wilkinson had an agreement with the Spanish to extradite deserters from either side. Cushing to the Spanish Governor, 5 September, 1799, Cushing Letter Book, Letters Sent, 47–48.

[42] Secretary of War to the President, 28 July, 1792, Carter, IV, 159.

[43] In 1793 Governor Blount became much concerned about deserters who had joined the Cherokee. In addition to ordinary rewards, the Governor promised twenty dollars and a keg of whiskey for the apprehension of these men. Blount to Secretary of War, 15 May, 1793, Carter, IV, 258–259.

[44] See, for example, Lt. Col. Richard Sparks to Secretary of War, 12 July, 1810, Carter, VI, 81. Sparks referred to the number of desertions at Fort Stoddert as being so great as "will appear to you Sir no doubt remarkable." Dread of the climate at Fort Stoddert was a chief factor in the high rate of desertion there.

Reviewing officers sometimes saw fit to remit all or part of the punishment assigned by courts martial. Thus several soldiers sentenced to wear the ball and chain were released in 1811 at Baton Rouge, some of these, at least, having "manifested Great wideness of repentance for their [sic] offence. . . ."[45] The sentence of an old soldier or of a sick or wounded man might also be reduced.[46] Men sentenced at Baton Rouge for appearing on parade dirty were excused because of the scarcity of soap, or because the court itself took pity on one man who would have been forced to exhaust "his small pitence" [sic] in buying items to keep himself clean.[47] Another man, sentenced to receive fifty lashes "on his bare posterious" [sic] was indulged in having the said lashes applied to his bare back instead, the reviewing officer invoking "considerations of delicacy."[48]

The soldier was also subject to the jurisdiction of the civil authorities for certain offenses. In some cases, however, determined officers might shield themselves or their men against the civil authorities.[49] On the other hand, Judge Harry Toulmin of Mississippi Territory was charged with having examined civilian witnesses at Fort Stoddert "at the point of a Bayonet—."[50] Other cases are found in which a military defendant was released to the civil authorities for trial.[51]

---

45 General Orders, Baton Rouge, 25 April, 1811, no pagination.

46 Garrison Orders, Fort Adams, 18 January, 1808, no pagination; Garrison Orders, Baton Rouge, 17 April, 1811, no pagination; Orders, Cantonment Washington, 18 August, 1810, no pagination.

47 Orders, Baton Rouge, 8 April, 1811, no pagination; Orders, Cantonment Washington, 18 August, 1810, no pagination.

48 Garrison Orders, Fort Adams, 3 March, 1808, no pagination.

49 In Lively vs. Ledbetter, 1813, the County Commissioner's Court of Randolph County, Illinois Territory, decided that it had no jurisdiction over the defendant, a soldier who had defaulted on a debt, because he "at the time of his arrest was in the regular service of the army of the United States. . . ." Randolph County Commissioners' Court Record, 1811–1814, Session of 28 June, 1813.

50 Grand Jury Presentment, Baldwin County, Mississippi Territory (no date), enclosure in Cowles Mead to Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, 20 November, 1811, Carter, VI, 243–246.

51 In 1792 a sergeant of the First United States Regiment (regular army) was tried in the Court of Quarter Sessions of Hamilton County, Northwest Territory, for assault and battery against a citizen, and was found guilty. The sergeant was sentenced to pay a fine of three dollars, to receive fifteen lashes, and to make bond for his future good behavior for six months. Acting Governor Sargent remitted the corporal punishment, but confirmed the rest of the sentence. Proclamation of Acting Governor Sargent, 17 February, 1792, Carter, III, 365–366. In another case, a man, charged with forgery in Canada, had fled to Detroit and had subsequently enlisted in the United States Army; upon the request of the Canadian authorities, this man was ordered extradited. Request of Acting Governor Sargent to Lt. Col. David Strong, 8 May, 1798; Sargent to Peter Audrian, 8 May, 1798, both in Carter, III, 506–507.

Territorial legislation gave soldiers a special legal status in reference to the drawing up of wills, it being provided in both the Northwest Territory and Indiana Territory that nuncupative wills of soldiers and sailors were to be excepted from general rules of probate.[52]

NORMAN W. CALDWELL

Southern Illinois University

[52] Act of 19 June, 1795, *Laws of Northwest Territory* in *Illinois Historical Collections*, XVII, 234. See also *Laws of Indiana Territory, ibid.*, XXI, 284, for a similar act passed in 1807.

Catholic Press Reaction to the Custer Disaster

In 1876, the Indian Bureau requested that certain wild bands of Plains Indians should be compelled to settle on their reservations under the guidance and control of an Indian agent.[1] The War Department authorized this action against the "hostiles" who were under the commands of Sitting Bull, on the Little Missouri in Dakota, and Crazy Horse on the Powder River in Wyoming.[2] The army forces were under the direction of General Philip Sheridan while other leaders of the expedition were Generals Alfred Terry, George Crook, John Gibbon, and George Custer. Thus began a series of events which were to culminate in the largest engagement between hostile Indians and organized troops on the North American continent. The tragic climax came on June 25, 1876, when General George A. Custer and five troops of the Seventh United States Cavalry, 225 men, were completely wiped out by Indians at the battle of the Little Big Horn River in Montana. This episode has ever since intrigued historians of the West and may be considered one of the most popular in all American historiography.

The nation was to learn for the first time of this disaster through a special correspondent of the *Herald* of Helena, Montana, in a dispatch dated July 2, 1876. The shocking news stunned the country, and it is not surprising that some Catholic publications should have commented on this famous incident in American history. During this time, Catholic newspapers were published weekly, so that news appearing in them was usually late and copied from secular dailies. However, the editorial opinions of Catholic editors cast an interesting light on the reaction of one segment of American society to the story of the Little Big Horn. A lack of an enduring Catholic

---

[1] It is rather paradoxical that General Custer should have been killed while attempting to carry out these orders, in view of what he had written a few months before his death: "I often think that if I were an Indian I would greatly prefer to cast my lot among those of my people who adhered to the free open plains rather than submit to the confined limits of a reservation, there to be the recipient of the blessed benefits of civilization, with its vices thrown in without stint or measure." See General George Custer, *My Life on the Plains*, New York, 1876, 18.

[2] The term "hostiles" was used at this time in reference to any Indian band living off the established reservations.

interest in the incident may be deduced from the scarcity of articles in the less frequently published Catholic periodicals.[3]

While the news of the Custer affair was traveling eastward, the *Western Home Journal* of the Diocese of Detroit carried an article dated July 8, 1876, taken from the *New York Sun* concerning Generals Crook, Gibbon, and Terry's march into the Black Hills. Commenting on the expedition, it deplored the fact that the generals' action was leading to a "bloody, fruitless, and expensive war." The opinion was expressed that the Sioux would fight desperately for their Black Hills country, "to which they are entitled by law and equity... They are fighting for their rightful country and the hunting grounds of which they justly claim possession, they will stand to the last and give no quarter." This attitude, which was shared by many of the leading philanthropists of the time, was based on the reasoning that because the Indians, and not the white men, were the original inhabitants of the United States they possessed inalienable rights which were unjustly being snatched away. Among Catholics, James McMaster, editor of the New York *Freeman's Journal,* as will be seen, was especially influenced by this belief and it appeared in much of his writing.

The question as to whether the authority over the Indians should be or should not be transferred from the Department of the Interior to the War Department was argued from 1867–1879.[4] Some Catholic papers took sides in the controversy between the exponents and opponents of the Indian extermination policy, and the article which the *Western Home Journal* printed expressed their feelings toward the army by saying:

> ... our troops have long looked on the killing of a red skin with the same nonchalance as a street boy on killing a wharf rat. It has not been a rare thing in the history of the life on the plains for men to go out

[3] Edward Jacker, "Who is to Blame for The Little Big Horn Disaster," *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* October, 1876, 713–739. The title of the article is completely misleading. After mentioning Custer briefly, it proceeds to give the earliest known history of the Sioux as taken from French writings concerning the Jesuits. Father Jacker's implication is that if those missionaries had had a more lasting influence upon the Indians, the Sioux would not have been warlike. The *Catholic World,* leading Catholic magazine, gave no comment whatsoever. Not even its review of outstanding events in the year 1876 mentioned the battle of the Little Big Horn. *Brownson's Review* resumed publication that year, but too late to comment upon the event. The *Ave Maria,* a devotional magazine, carried the story concerning Captain Keogh which was reprinted from the *Catholic Telegraph;* cf. *infra.* The item was carried under "Catholic Notes" with Keogh's name mispelled "Kehoe."

[4] Loring Benson Priest, *Uncle Sam's Stepchildren,* New Brunswick, 1942, 15.

hunting Indians as the Prince of Wales did tigers in the jungles of his mother's East Indian Empire.

However, since Grant's Administration was under investigation it did not escape attack, and the entire cause of Indian trouble was laid upon the type of Indian agents appointed by the government, "a more scurvy lot of fellows than the Indian agents it would be hard to pick up anywhere." The stories of graft provoked indignant remarks against the administration, but this journal offered no solution to the problem and conceded, "the blackest blot on our civilization is the manner in which we treated the Indians. Canada and the Indians are at peace," the paper exclaimed, "because they have been righteously dealt with."[5] The following week, on July 15, the story from Montana was released together with a full statement by General Terry. The Detroit paper then became strangely silent and not until August 12, in the form of two short news paragraphs, was there any mention of the Indian war.

Rather unique insofar as it expressed the prevalent feeling of western hatred on its front page was *The San Francisco Monitor,* which carried its opinion in a small paragraph. It was one thing, the Catholic editor on the coast thought, for complacent easterners, who feared the loss of neither life nor property, to sympathize and defend the Indians; and another thing for a westerner, who felt he was in constant danger of losing both, to do so. "Frontier hostility, unlike the sentimentality of the East, was firmly based on practical experience with the tribes."[6] The rumors which spread after the battle only succeeded in increasing this hostility. Is it any wonder that cries for revenge were uttered after reading, for example, that the Indians had cut out Custer's heart, placed it on a pole, and did a war dance around it!

> The massacre of General Custer and his brave band has aroused a stronger war feeling throughout the country than has been known since the war fever of 1861. The feeling is universal that his death must be avenged, even if it requires the extermination of the Sioux nation. Offers of volunteers have been made to the War Department from different portions of the country, more particularly from the Territories west of the Rocky Mountains, and an act will doubtless pass Congress authorizing the acceptance of such aid. It is now too late to discuss the equities of the Sioux, the slaughter on the Little Big Horn must be avenged.[7]

---

[5] *Ibid.*, 173. "While the United States recognized Indian rights theoretically but was forced to violate them, the Dominion granted the Indians less but lived up to her bargains.... Canadian Indian policy was a success not because Canadian Indians were treated more liberally than those of the United States, but because they were treated more fairly."

[6] *Ibid.*, 68.

[7] July 15, 1876.

The *Monitor's* article, although brief, was very much to the point. The use of such strong and un-Christian words as "avenge" and "extermination" was not found in any other Catholic publication; however, the *Monitor* expressed western feeling and the spirit of the times as embodied in the maxim, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth."

A good example of contrasting opinion to the *Monitor's* violent reaction was to be found in the *Boston Pilot*. The views as presented in an editorial showed a remarkably enlightened attitude toward Custer's fatal engagement. The fact must not be overlooked that the *Pilot* highly disapproved of the government's dealings with the Sioux, consequently the disaster provided an occasion for severe criticism. It cited a record of broken treaties, unpaid congressional grants, and frauds perpetrated against the Indians. The article called particular attention to the Sioux refusal to sell the Black Hills after Grant's appointed commissioners met the Sioux chiefs at the Red Cloud Agency in 1875. The high price asked of the commissions was refused.[8]

> They [Sioux] bitterly complained of the inroads and demoralization of the whites; and they asked for schools and a Catholic priest to teach them.[9] Their requests were ignored, and their refusal to sell did not save them from invasion... Thousands of armed adventurers flocked into their country, determined to hold the land by the right of the rifle... The Sioux have grimly defended their own, though they have done it with the tomahawk and scalpel knife.

The striking feature of the editorial, however, was its strong emphasis on the fairness of the fight and its forceful insistence on the injustice of the demand for revenge. Expressing its sorrow over the loss of Custer, "a bold, free-handed, romantic, daredevil, young leader," who loved fighting for its own sake, it nevertheless insisted:

> The Sioux warriors did not murder Custer and his soldiers. They met him in fair fight, out-generalled him, and cut him to pieces. He tried to do the same to them.... The story of the terrible affair is elsewhere told. No one can read it without seeing that Custer's bravery out ran his

---

[8] Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, *A History of the United States*, New York, 1926, III, 398–399.

[9] "And the *Chicago Times*, in commenting upon the insistent petition of Chief Red Cloud of the Sioux for Catholic teachers and schools, queried: "If the Indian asks for this kind of spiritual meat, why give him a stone?" Quoted in Peter J. Rahill, *The Catholic Indian Missions and Grant's Peace Policy 1870–1884*, Washington, D. C., 1953, 150, 209. "The administration of Indian affairs was clearly dominated by Protestants whose churches were constantly urging positive action against Catholic Indians"; Priest, *Uncle Sam's Stepchildren*, 35.

caution. It was a fair fight—and the Indians won. There was no ambush—no trickery.... In no civilized war has there been a fairer fight, Custer went in with his eyes open, and met the bloody result of recklessness. There is no justice in the cry for vengeance. There is far more need of a cry for fair play. If the death of Custer bring about an honest consideration of the Indian's rights, the blood of the brave soldiers has not been spilled in vain.

The liberal attitude of the *Pilot* did not blind it to the fact that public reaction to what was immediately called a "massacre"[10] would preclude for a time a calm consideration of the Indian problem. As the editorial put it:

> The death of the most dashing officer of the Army—the Murat of our service—will prevent for a time the righteous consideration of this question. The border cry of vengeance is heard already, and it is probable that an attempt will be made to extirpate the entire Sioux. But the day will come when these things will cry to Heaven against the United States.[11]

The July 22 issue of the *Pilot* carried its last reference to Custer. A full column was dedicated to a poem written in heroic terms by Joseph I. C. Clark entitled "Custer's Last Charge." This issue also included an article by a *Chicago Tribune* reporter concerning the reminiscences of three officers who had served under Custer. The comments concerning Custer's character and Civil War record by Colonel Birge, Major Deane, and Captain Ballard were extremely favorable. Another item, attacking Grant, was taken from the *Louisville Courier Journal* and alluding to Custer, it ended with the words, "Down with his assassins—the radical administration."

The *Catholic Universe Bulletin* of Cleveland, the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore, and the *Catholic Telegraph* of Cincinnati gave less

---

10 "Not unfairly called this, since no quarter was given and since the bodies of the slain, except Custer's which was spared, were most atrociously beheaded, and otherwise mutilated." Oberholtzer, 415. Colonel Graham, an authority on Custeriana, refutes the above statement. He claims it has been inaccurately termed, "Warfare, however it be savage, is not massacre when the conquered go to their death with arms in their hands." He states further concerning mutilation, "... contrary to general belief there was no universal mutilation of the bodies of the slain, except those few of Reno's command who fell close to the village and were subjected to the indignities by the squaws and children... But on Custer's field... save for scalping, the invariable custom of Indian warfare, there was comparatively little mutilation of the soldier dead." Colonel W. A. Graham, *The Story of the Little Big Horn*, New York, 1926, 106–107.

11 *Boston Pilot*, July 15, 1876, of which John Boyle O'Reilly was editor from 1870, and from April 15, 1876, co-proprietor with Archbishop John J. Williams, replacing Patrick Donahoe. O'Reilly exerted a wide influence through this paper, becoming famous for his liberal Catholic attitude. Sister Mary Alphonsine Frawley, *Patrick Donahoe*, Washington, 1946, 254.

attention to the political implications of the disaster at the Little Big Horn. The *Universe Bulletin* carried only one story describing Sitting Bull, a few Indian customs, and the appearance of an Indian war camp.[12] The *Mirror* took the opportunity to attack the Republican administration's radical reconstruction policy by merely reprinting an article taken from the *Irish Democrat.* Attributing the defeat and death of "gallant" Custer to the uneven distribution of the military forces, it compared, for example, "the 269 men [*sic*] with Custer to the 7,052 men" still to be found stationed in the South. The *Mirror* agreed with the *Irish Democrat* which concluded, "If Democratic orators be wise they would repeat these figures until every voter knows them by heart."[13] The *Telegraph* printed only two brief articles on the battle as such. The account, as released by the Helena correspondent, was published in its issue dated July 13. The other mention of the event was a report discrediting the rumor that General Crook's command had also been slaughtered.[14]

Somewhat more elaborate was the first account to be found in the *Connecticut Catholic,* which reported that a battle had taken place between United States troops and the Indians. The paper, although lacking details, was ready to pass editorial judgments. It definitely felt that "our soldiers did not come out of the fight very much first best," and charged that if the troops had been severely repulsed the blame would rest with Grant. Custer had given offense to President Grant by becoming involved in the impeachment pending against Secretary of War William Belknap, who had resigned under fire. By the president's order Custer was removed from command, and to his great humiliation, was forbidden to accompany the expedition in any capacity whatever. The order was rescinded through the efforts of General Terry, and, at the last minute, he was allowed to accompany the expedition, but only as commander of the Seventh Cavalry.[15] In the light of this the Connecticut paper commented:

> The day that Grant to gratify the spite of himself and his corrupt associates, against a brave officer who told the truth about them removed General Custer he struck a deadly blow at the efficiency of the then pending Indian expedition; and the army and the nation will be fortunate if both do not yet have to suffer severely for the particular act of the patron and protector of the "Ring" thieves.

---

12 July 22, 1876.
13 July 29, 1876.
14 August 3, 1876.
15 July 8, 1876. Graham, *Story of the Little Big Horn,* 8–9.

A final editorial reference was made in connection with Catholic missionary work. In mentioning that the continuance of Catholic missionaries among them would have resulted in a peaceful Sioux nation, the *Connecticut Catholic* merely touched on a theme that was elaborated by its neighbor, the New York *Freeman's Journal*.[16]

The New York paper reflected the forceful, even if at times over-zealous, attitude of its editor, James A. McMaster. McMaster, a convert to Catholicism, had long been critical of the government's treatment of the Indians.[17] The editorial theme throughout 1876 harped on Grant's wicked "Methodist War" on the Indians, as McMaster recounted the influence of the Methodist ministers in shaping the Indian policy of 1870 which had had such disastrous results for Catholic Indians.[18] The blame for the Indian's mistreatment was placed upon both parties; however, the Democratic administration to McMaster's mind had not been quite so bad. It was true, only to a certain extent, that the Democrats' appointed agents had enriched themselves by defrauding the Indians, but the crowning wrong was accomplished through Grant and what was called more generally his "Quaker Policy." As McMaster stated it:

> Then was inaugurated one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of crimes of Grant's bad administration. . . . The Methodist plan, which they, cunningly called *Quaker,* was to apportion the Indians as "dumb, driven cattle," among ever so many religious denominations.

The *Freeman's Journal* of July 15, 1876, had carried the detailed account of the Custer destruction, and one week later in an editorial denouncing Grant's policy, McMaster found occasion to mention the dead leader:

> You have 'reserved' tens of thousands of them [Indians] for your Methodists and others, Preachers who have been linked in with you. Post-traders selling improved firearms, at an exhorbitant price, to the Indians—who have used them against Custer and his squadron, and will use them again. The practical result of the cruel massacre of Custer and his command, should be immediate revoking of the Grant-Methodist swindle—called the 'Quaker' plan, and remitting the entire Indian management to the War Department.[19]

---

16 The *Connecticut Catholic,* August 19, 1876, quoting *The Columbian,* "If the United States Government had left the Indians free to be instructed in the only religion that ever converted any of them to Christianity, the whole army of the plains would now be a reminiscence of the past."

17 Rahill, *Catholic Indian Missions,* 172.

18 Sister Mary Augustine Kwitchen, *James Alphonsus McMaster,* Washington, 1949, 205.

19 July 22, 1876.

McMaster, in spite of his crusading zeal, was very cool toward the Catholic Indian Bureau which had been established under Charles Ewing and Father Jean-Baptiste A. Brouillet.[20] In indicting the Peace Policy and its operations, the New York editor had also condemned the Catholic bureau for co-operating with the federal Indian Office. Ewing and Brouillet felt that editorials, such as the one just mentioned, would create open hostility to such extent that the Church might be deprived of everything.[21] The *Freeman's Journal* continued to hammer at the Republican administration, but the Custer incident was not again used editorially.[22]

A rather different approach to the "massacre" was carried by both the *Brooklyn Catholic Review* and the *Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph.* Grant's administration and Catholic missionaries faded into the background, while the emphasis was centered upon one Captain Myles Keogh. His life had been a record of adventures. Born in County Carlow in Ireland, Keogh at the age of twenty had joined General Louis Christofano de Lamoricière, who had taken command of the papal army, and followed him to Italy. Keogh, for gallantry displayed, was decorated by Pope Pius IX with the medal *Pro Petri Sede.* In 1862 he resigned his command in the Pontifical Zouaves and embarked for the United States, where he joined the Union Army. A few months after the demobilization of the Union forces in 1866, Keogh was mustered out and promoted to "Captain, Seventh Cavalry with brevets of Major for 'Gettysburg' and Lt. Colonel for the War."[23] It is not surprising that at least two Catholic papers, spotting this Irish name, should have emphasized it, since their readers would be predominantly Irish.

The case of Keogh, as illustrated by the *Catholic Telegraph,* was useful as an answer to anti-Catholic sentiments:

> His grave in the distant West, where he lies with his Agnus Dei resting upon his bosom, awaiting the resurrection, will tell the bigots of this country that a Catholic never falters in his duty to the government, no matter what sacrifice it may cost or what dangers may confront him. Peace

---

[20] McMaster's advice to transfer the entire Indian management to the War Department was in direct opposition to official opinion as expressed by the Catholic Bureau, "but since the *Freeman's Journal* was not a diocesan organ, it was subject to no direct episcopal supervision," Priest, 24; Rahill, 220.

[21] Rahill, 200.

[22] In an issue dated August 5, 1876, the *Freeman's Journal* printed an Indian's version of the fight along with a story about Captain Myles Keogh's presentiment of death which led him to draw up a will.

[23] Edward S. Luce, *Keogh, Comanche and Custer,* (n.p.: privately printed), 1939, has the story of Keogh.

to the soul of the gallant Papal Zouave and faithful soldier of the United States.[24]

This paper's article included some background on Keogh which, it may be presumed, was hastily gathered.[25] The *Catholic Review,* while not as fulsome, did report, "Before he had won distinction in American service he gained it in fighting for the Pope against Italian red men."[26] Both journals made much of the fact that Keogh had not been mutilated. The *Review* stressed the theory that the Indians, seeing an "Agnus Dei" around his neck, remembered their friend, Father Pierre de Smet, S.J., famous Sioux missionary; while the *Telegraph* based the supposition on a current rumor that Sitting Bull had been baptized a Catholic.[27] Investigations since the time of the battle have not mentioned these reasons, but have stressed the fact that Keogh was well known to the Indians and respected by them for his bravery.[28] A recent student of the episode suggests that what was called in so many accounts his "Agnus Dei," was actually his papal medal which he wore in a leather case around his neck. This would have been readily mistaken by the Indians as a charm for which they would have superstitious regard.[29]

A unique feature of the *Telegraph's* editorial comment was a lyric of praise for Keogh's patriotism and faith. "To his adopted country he has been as true and as loyal as he was to his faith. He was the soul of honor, as fair a specimen of Christian chivalry as ever entered battle." It went on to tell of a poor Catholic servant girl calling at the cathedral in Cincinnati to have Masses said for

---

[24] *Catholic Telegraph,* July 20, 1876.

[25] It incorrectly informed the readers that during the Civil War Keogh had served on the staff of General Steadman in place of the staffs of Generals Buford and Stoneman. Frederick Whittaker, *General George A. Custer,* New York, 1876, 598.

[26] *Catholic Review,* Brooklyn, July 29, 1876.

[27] Jacker, *loc. cit.,* 739. The *Review* included an even more improbable story that Sitting Bull was not only a student of French but of Napoleonic tactics which he used against the army.

[28] Julia B. McGillycuddy, *McGillycuddy, Agent,* Stanford, 1941, 78.

[29] Luce, *Keogh,* 62–63, while maintaining that Keogh was wearing the papal medal, presents a hypothesis based on the fact that it carried the symbol which should be on a waxen *Agnus Dei,* "As the Indians were stripping the body, they came upon a medal in a leather case attached to a cord around his neck. It was his Medaglia di Pro Petri Sede... What they made of it we do not know. Perhaps they thought it was the white man's idea of mountain sheep, for they were in the land of the big horns. This great chief of the white men had evidently gone high up among the cold crags to importune the Great Spirit for guidance, as every warrior is bound to do before battle, and had received this medicine."

Keogh's soul. As a domestic in the house of an army officer colleague of his, she had admired Keogh from afar, and could, as the editorial put it, "testify with tears to the modest, humble piety, of this fearless sabreur." There was not much of prophecy in the further comment, "The memory of such a Catholic cannot perish," for Keogh was later reported buried with a Protestant Episcopal ceremony and the Catholic press was silent.[30]

This sampling of press opinion, which included the most influential Catholic journals in the United States, would indicate that there was no single Catholic reaction to the Custer episode. Yet there was an area of agreement in the general use of the occasion by these papers to attack Grant's administration. As journals addressing themselves mostly to Irish Catholics, it may have been an instinctive reaction. History, however, has borne out the justice of the views of Catholic editors concerning the hostility of Grant's peace policy to their Church. Particularly acute, in this regard, were John Boyle O'Reilly and McMaster, and certainly in the light of subsequent developments, the *Boston Pilot's* editorial wisdom was remarkable.

This brief contribution to Custeriana is only a small footnote in comparison to the publication of over 600 items on that single historical event.[31] It might, nonetheless, indicate an area of possible future study involving public opinion on the battle of the Little Big Horn, and of the consequent influence of such feelings in shaping the later American Indian policy.

MARIE LOUISE SCHULTE

Catholic University of America

[30] *Morning News*, Auburn, New York, October 26, 1877, quoted in Luce, 118–119.

[31] Colonel W. A. Graham, *The Custer Myth*, Harrisburg, 1953. This source book of Custeriana and fully annotated bibliography does not include the latest addition to the field, viz., Edgar I. Stewart, *Custer's Luck*, Norman, Oklahoma, 1955. The abundance of literature on the question is such that divergent speculations are merely being added to the little known and debated facts.

Contemporary English Catholics and the Policies of James II.

As every proverbial English schoolboy knows, whether in Macaulay's time or since, the attempt of James II to promote the cause of Catholicism in the British Isles was a complete failure. Much less clearly understood is the reaction of the English Catholic clergy and laity to the King's efforts. It is to a consideration of the latter that this paper is directed.

A brief perusal of the more prominent events in the career of this ill-fated monarch is required to place the problem in perspective. James Stuart was converted to Catholicism in middle age, an event which provoked a determined effort to exclude him from succession to the throne. The endeavor barely failed and in 1685 James, heretofore Duke of York, succeeded his brother Charles II as King of England. Headstrong, impetuous, politically inept, embittered by a decade of persecution, accusation, and calumny and, like all the Stuarts, convinced that kings ruled by divine right, James pursued a political and religious policy that soon cost him his throne.

Motivated perhaps by a love of religious toleration as a principle but more likely by a desire eventually to turn toleration into Catholic supremacy[1] the King: 1. Repealed the Test Act of 1673 which had, in effect, barred Catholics from holding public office; 2. Began to build a standing army, officered by Catholics, though Catholics were forbidden to undertake military service; 3. Prorogued parliament and accepted subsidies from his powerful and hated Catholic cousin, Louis XIV of France; 4. Forced the English universities, in violation of existing law, to admit Catholics to fellowships and degrees; 5. Promulgated the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687 and 1688 which granted religious toleration to all; 6. Imprisoned several Anglican bishops for refusing to read the Second Declaration in their churches; and 7. Reactivated the Court of Ecclesiastical Commission, whose activities had been instrumental in provoking the civil war of the 1640's, to govern the English Church. These measures were undertaken in a predominantly

[1] Two authorities of such disparate views as Father John Lingard and the skeptical philosopher David Hume concur in this judgment; John Lingard, *History of England*, Edinburgh, 1902, X, 127; David Hume, *History of England*, New York, 1879, VI, 353.

Protestant country where fear and hatred of Catholicism was so ingrained that the grotesque "Popish Plot" could secure wide credence. They drove almost all James' Protestant supporters into opposition to him, to a final result in the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688.

The attitudes adopted by European, and particularly English, Catholics towards these ill-considered efforts to aid the Roman Church form an interesting study of the ways in which conflicting ambition, hope, zeal, and prudence can color the minds and deeds of men.

The condition of English Catholicism in the 1680's was forlorn. From the time of Elizabeth I the ranks of Catholics had dwindled steadily under persecution until they now numbered a bare ten per cent of the population.[2] Such incidents as the missionary activities and "plots" of the Jesuits in the reign of Elizabeth, the Gunpowder Plot of 1603, and the "Popish Plot" of 1676, had brought discredit and persecution to nearly all English Catholics. The close ties of Charles II with the national enemy, France, had increased popular suspicion of and disdain for "papists." Misfortune had been their lot in other ways as well. Most of them had sided with the Royalists in the civil war of 1641–1649. When Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660 they hoped for some reward, but received none. The vicissitudes of the seventeenth century had taken their toll in the ranks of the clergy too. Proscribed, hunted, and lacking proper ecclesiastical supervision, the morale and *esprit de corps* of the English Catholic clergy had suffered badly.[3] Thus by the 1680's the English Catholics were decimated, disunited, persecuted, dispirited, and politically unrepresented.

To them the accession of James II seemed a glorious event, a sweet deliverance from a century and a quarter of subjection. It was immediately followed by an outburst of Catholic activity of every sort. A considerable number of Catholics, now free to go where they liked, flocked to court to seek offices and sinecures.[4] Others

---

[2] This is the estimate of Brian Magee whose careful study *The English Recusants*, London, 1938, sheds much light upon the plight of seventeenth century English Catholicism; cf. especially 126-149, 162-164, 169-171, 207.

[3] W. Maziere Brady, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland*, London, 1877, 125.

[4] A case in point was that of William Blundell, the descendant of an old Catholic family who had lived near Liverpool for centuries. Blundell tried to secure a civil appointment by applying to Father John Warner, James' Jesuit confessor; Margaret Blundell, ed., *Cavalier: Letters of William Blundell to His Friends 1620–1698*, London, 1933, 243, 249–250.

packed the courtroom where Titus Oates was being tried for the perjuries which had sent several innocent Catholics to their deaths during the "Popish Plot" craze.[5] Many attended the Masses which the King ordered celebrated publicly in a newly opened chapel in Whitehall.[6] At Windsor, where the King held the familiar ceremony of touching for scrofula, he dismissed his Protestant chaplains and was attended by priests who conducted the service in Latin.[7] Several prominent Catholics accepted patents of nobility; others became Privy Councillors or judges; and a considerable number accepted posts as justices of the peace and city commissioners.[8]

The clergy in particular grew active and vocal. Everywhere the Catholic nobility either brought their chaplains and domestic confessors out of hiding or welcomed them back from exile. Masses, Sunday preachings, festivals, catechetical instructions, baptisms of Nonconformist converts, even public disputations with Protestants, were widely held before large congregations.[9] A confirmation ceremony was conducted in the chapel of Magdalen College, Oxford; Catholic bishops were publicly consecrated; Count Ferdinand d' Adda, the papal nuncio, was received by the King in a public audience; and monks and nuns regularly appeared in public in their habits.[10] Numerous schools, churches, and monasteries were opened by religious orders, secular clergy, and Catholic nobles. The Carmelites established a community house at Bargeyard[11] and the Franciscan

---

5 William Bray, ed., *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, London, 1894, 1900, II, 231, hereinafter cited as Evelyn, *Diary*. Oates and the other scoundrels who had been key figures in the "Popish Plot" were punished ferociously in James' reign. This was not sheer vindictiveness on the part of the Government, however, for a Catholic who assassinated one of the perjurers (Dangerfield) was executed for his deed three weeks later; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs from 1678 to 1714*, Oxford, 1857, I, 351, 354-355.

6 Evelyn, *Diary*, II, 222; Barillon to Louis XIV, March 1, 1685, *Correspondence Between Louis XIV and M. Barillon on English Affairs from December, 1684 to December, 1685*, in appendix of Charles James Fox, *A History of the Early Part of the Reign of James the Second*, London, 1808.

7 Luttrell, *Relation*, I, 378.

8 *Ibid.*, I, 369-443.

9 Henry Foley, S.J., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, London, 1879, V, 149, 151, 153; J. G. Muddiman, *The Bloody Assizes*, London, 1929, 186.

10 Luttrell, *Relation*, I, 405–409, 430, 439; Rev. Henry Fleming to Sir Daniel Fleming, July 29, 1688, in John Richard Magrath, ed., *The Flemings in Oxford 1650–1700, Being Documents Selected from the Rydal Papers in Illustration of the Lives and Ways of Oxford Men 1650–1700*, Oxford, 1913, II, 220 and footnote 220; Andrew Clark, ed., *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood Antiquary of Oxford, 1632–1695, Described by Himself*, Oxford, 1894, II, 266.

11 Ethelred L. Taunton, *The History of the Jesuits in England*, New York, 1898, 175.

friars built one at Lincoln's Inn Fields.[12] The Benedictines established a royal monastery at St. James' Palace, a convent at St. John's, Clerkenwell, and several other communities. Chapels were opened in several parts of London, in the universities, and by such members of the nobility as the Earl of Salisbury and Lord Berkeley. The Jesuits were particularly active in these endeavors, setting up chapels and schools at Wigan, Durham, Newcastle, Lincoln, Norwich, and Pontefact, as well as two colleges in London, one at the Royal Hospital of the Savoy and the other near the Bavarian Embassy on Fenchurch Street. The Order even found time to take over from the secular clergy chapels at Holywell and on Lime Street, London.[13] All of these institutions were conducted in an ostentatious fashion which Protestants found infuriating.[14]

All this religious activity had its literary counterpart. A veritable flood of pamphlets, pictures, and books flowed from hastily established Catholic presses. One of the most prolific of these was operated in London by Henry Hills, newly licensed "printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty."[15] Another was located in the lodgings of Obadiah Walker, a Catholic priest whom James had forced University College, Oxford, to admit to a fellowship. Walker published several books "savouring of popery" and, without securing the permission of the vice-Chancellor, gave them out to Oxford booksellers.[16]

The effectiveness of all this preaching and pamphleteering is difficult to estimate. Henry Foley credits the Jesuits with securing several hundred converts during James' reign.[17] Among contemporaries, conversions appeared to Reresby in 1687 to be "numerous",[18] while another observer lamented in 1685 that so many "deceitfull and indifferent" persons had become Catholic in order to seek advancement under a Catholic king.[19] On the other hand,

---

12 Muddiman, *Bloody Assizes*, 186.

13 *Publications of the Catholic Record Society*, London, 1925, III, 105. In the latter instance they brought charges of Jansenism against the incumbent clerical staff; Taunton, *Jesuits in England*, 445–456.

14 For a much fuller description of these places and their activities cf. Foley, *Jesuit Records*, V, 266, 268; John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., "A Jesuit 'Free School' in London 1688," *The Month*, September, 1916, 264–267.

15 Thomas Babington Macaulay, *History of England from the Accession of James II*, Philadelphia, 1861, II, 168; Andrew Browning, ed., *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, Glasglow, 1936, 425.

16 Rev. Henry Fleming to Sir Daniel Fleming, March 14, 1687, *Flemings in Oxford*, 190–201 and footnote 191; cf. also 142–143, (footnote).

17 Foley, V, 267, 334. Cf. also "B.N.", *The Jesuits: Their Foundation and History*, New York, 1879, II, 94.

18 Reresby, *Memoirs*, 452.

19 Walter MacLeod, ed., *Journal of the Honorable John Erskine of Carnock 1683–1687*, Edinburgh, 1893, 149.

the Anglican Bishop Burnet described conversions as "few"[20] and the Earl of Perth, Royal Chancellor of Scotland, bewailed the almost total absence of conversions in that country.[21] Whatever the number of converts, the most illustrious of them was the poet John Dryden. Then England's first man of letters, Dryden was at once pressed into service to defend Catholic doctrine. His best known apologetic work was the famous poem *The Hind and the Panther.*

Objectively, all this clerical enthusiasm and missionary activity was worthy enough, but it violated the law of the land and led Protestants to exaggerate Catholic numbers and purposes even more wildly than before. Significantly, most of these newly erected chapels and schools, as well as the houses of some Catholics, were set upon by mobs and razed in November and December, 1688.[22]

English Catholicism quickly formed two schools of thought with regard to the religious policies of James II and the missionary efforts to the clergy. One group, small in number but conspicuous in the public eye since it was composed of court nobles, clergymen, and politicians, urged the King to act quickly and energetically to strike all the fetters off Catholicism. All of these persons gravely underestimated the anti-Catholic temper of the country and by their excessive zeal and unwise personal conduct made trouble for the King everywhere. They gave James consistently bad advice and helped persuade him to flee the country in 1688—a course which ruined whatever chance he might have had to retain his throne. The more prominent of these "extremists" will be considered individually.

One such was James Drummond, Fourth Earl of Perth. Perth was Chancellor and First Commissioner of the Treasury in Scotland, a land even more determinedly Protestant than England. Though he had frequently expressed disapproval of some Catholic doctrines before 1685,[23] with the accession of James II he became a convert to Catholicism. For three years Perth and his brother Lord Melfort, the Secretary of State, were the rulers of Scotland. They at once set up a private chapel for themselves, obtained churches for the secular and regular clergy, imported a half dozen German mis-

---

20 Gilbert Burnet, *History of My Own Times,* London, 1724, II, 383–385.

21 Earl of Perth to Cardinal Howard, February 3, 1688, in *Calendar of Stuart Papers, Publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission,* London, 1902, I, 31. Luttrell lists some of the more prominent converts. The number is small; Luttrell, *Relation,* I, 369, 391, 398–401, 446, 449.

22 Luttrell, *Relation,* I, 477, 483, 486, 488.

23 A. H. Millar, ed., *Glamis Book of Record, 1684–1689,* Edinburgh, 1890, 163–164.

sionaries into Scotland, tried to secure the repeal of the penal laws against Catholics, and made plans to establish a Jesuit college in the residence of the former Chancellors. The chief result of these enterprises was to provoke an Edinburgh mob to wreck Perth's chapel and to throw mud upon Chancellor Perth as he emerged from it.[24]

Another of James' advisers who served his master badly was Roger Palmer, the hot tempered, flashy, and pompous Earl of Castlemaine. In 1686 Castlemaine was appointed Ambassador to the Papacy. His instructions were to try to get cardinal's hats for Rinaldo d' Este, the Queen's uncle, and for Father Edward Petre, the King's trusted adviser and confidante, and to attempt to effect a reconciliation between the Pope and Louis XIV.[25] In Rome Castlemaine indulged his penchant for vulgar display, scandalized the austere Innocent XI by presenting his profligate wife at the Papal court,[26] ostentatiously cultivated those English and French Jesuits at the moment apparently estranged from the Papacy, and persisted so indiscreetly in his demands on behalf of Petre and d' Este that Innocent at length demanded that James recall his ambassador and apologize for his conduct. The King did apologize for Castlemaine but the whole fiasco was ill-received in England, particularly by Catholics who were shocked by the envoy's ill treatment of the Pope.[27]

Two less prominent royal advisers who helped make the King's cross heavy were Sir Roger Strickland and the Marquess of Albeville. Strickland, made an admiral by James, unwisely dismissed the Protestant chaplains from his ship and had Mass said, thereby provoking a near mutiny.[28] Albeville, the Ambassador to Holland, spent most of his time trying to get Bishop Burnet extradited to

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 163–164; Perth to Cardinal Howard, February 3, 1686, in *Stuart Papers*, I, 30; James Grant, ed., *Seafield Correspondence, 1685–1708*, Edinburgh, 1912, 16.

[25] At this time Louis XIV was engaged in a struggle with the Papacy that had grown out of his attempts to dominate completely the Church within his own dominions. Naturally, the Pope was hostile to Louis. He was likewise suspicious of James II and of the English and French Jesuits, both because they seemed so closely allied with Louis and because he was unconvinced that their impetuous zeal was likely to benefit the Catholic Church in England; G. M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688–1689*, London, 1938, 369; F. C. Turner, *James II*, New York, 1948, 325.

[26] Lady Castlemaine was the former Duchess of Cleveland, notorious as the mistress of Charles II and others.

[27] Turner, *ibid.*, 326; Lingard, *History of England*, X, 206–207, 259; Macaulay, *History of England*, II, 63, 190–193; Ludwig von Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, St. Louis, 1940, XXXII, 505.

[28] Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 483.

England, presumably to gratify James. So singlemindedly did he pursue Burnet that one may reasonably suspect that the Dutch purposely kept him on the bishop's trail in order to prevent him from acquiring knowledge of their preparations for the invasion of England.[29]

Burnet himself thought that Barillon, the French Ambassador, and Queen Mary Beatrice were more responsible than any others for the bent of royal policy and, therefore, for the ultimate downfall of the whole regime,[30] but in this he seems clearly mistaken. Barillon was such a close friend of the King that the jealousy of other envoys was aroused, and he naturally encouraged James to keep close to France,[31] but in only one instance (that the author was able to discover) is there evidence that his influence upon James was harmful. In 1688 he advised the distraught monarch to flee England, maintaining that the royal departure would plunge the country into chaos and anarchy and force Englishmen to beseech their sovereign to return.[32] There is equally little reason to view the Queen as playing Svengali to James' Trilby. Mary Beatrice was a proud woman, strongly influenced by priests, and vigilant to further the interests of her religion. Her published correspondence, however, could scarcely be more innocuous. It consists almost exclusively of letters to cardinals, abbesses, and prelates thanking them for prayers or favors, asking other favors, recommending persons to them, and so on. Upon only two occasions can it be said that her activities possessed noteworthy political importance. She exercised persistent pressure on Rome to have her uncle Rinaldo d' Este made a cardinal,[33] and she joined Barillon in imploring James to flee England in 1688.[34] In the first case she appears to have been motivated about equally by nepotism and by the belief that she was aiding the Church, and in the latter she was clearly the devoted wife worrying about the physical safety of her husband.

The most influential of James' counsellors and, therefore, the individuals most responsible for his downfall, were the Jesuit

---

29 Muddiman, *Bloody Assizes*, 186. Albeville's numerous memorials to the Dutch Government on the subject of Burnet are mentioned by Luttrell, *Brief Relations*, I, 426–427. Though the Ambassador spent the year 1688 in Holland he apparently knew nothing of the projected invasion.

30 Burnet, II, 322, 456.

31 Ruth Clark, *Sir William Trumbull in Paris, 1685–1686*, Cambridge, 1938, 6; Leopold von Ranke, *History of England*, Oxford, 1944, IV, 218, 226.

32 Hume, *History of England*, VI, 347.

33 For letters from the Queen to Castlemaine, the Pope, and Cardinals Howard and Cibo on Rinaldo's behalf, cf. *Stuart Papers*, I, 12–17. For the remainder of her correspondence cf. *ibid.*, I, 12–21.

34 Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 532.

Father Petre; Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland; and Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, the stormy, ill-tempered commander of the Irish army.[35] Father Petre, the King's most trusted adviser, was a man of good family and considerable natural intelligence who had gained the royal confidence by overseeing the education of some of James' natural children.[36] In character and personality he was much like his royal master—honest and ardent to improve the fortunes of his religion, but shortsighted, easily duped, and oblivious to the strength of the forces opposing him. He was, moreover, personally ambitious. More than any other man, Petre urged James to act boldly and directly to secure legal equality, religious freedom, and political advancement for English Catholics.[37] Petre secured the dismissal of the Franciscan Father Mansuete as royal confessor and his replacement by the Jesuit Father Warner because he disapproved of the moderate counsels of Mansuete.[38] He was instrumental in the foolhardy attempt to maintain Catholic converts in the universities.[39] He rashly accepted appointment to the Privy Council, apparently taking no thought of the effect this would have upon Protestant opinion—though it was notorious that Jesuits were regarded by most Protestant Englishmen as master criminals of superhuman cunning and villainy. Petre played a leading role in the ouster of the Earl of Rochester, the King's brother-in-law, as Treasurer. He also urged James to repeal the Test Act;[40] he may have been responsible for the order to the bishops to read the Declaration of Indulgence in their churches;[41] and in 1688 he counselled James to call upon Louis XIV for aid in withstanding the threatened Dutch invasion.

Petre was, however, in many ways merely the tool of a much subtler man, the Earl of Sunderland. The latter was an ambitious

---

35 Tyrconnel's activities in Ireland and the reaction of the Irish to the religious innovations of James II are a tale in themselves and will be dealt with by this writer in a separate article at a later time.

36 Thomas Sheridan, *Historical Narrative of the Reign of James II*, in *Calendar of Stuart Papers*, VI, 3.

37 Charles Butler, *Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics Since the Reformation*, London, 1822, III, 119.

38 Turner, *James II*, 305–306; Lingard, X, 257.

39 Turner, *ibid*, 340.

40 Lingard, X, 224. The Test Act, passed during the reign of Charles II, required that all appointees to a civil or military office subscribe to an oath or "test" which was so worded that no practicing Catholic could subscribe to it. The appointee was likewise expected to receive the sacrament in the Anglican Church within three months of assuming office.

41 This is the assertion of Burnet, who was neither well disposed towards Petre nor always reliable in what he included in his *History of My Own Times*, II, 464–465.

and venal politician whose many shifts of allegiance have few counterparts in English history. This lesser Talleyrand had voted for the exclusion of the Duke of York from the throne in 1679. When this effort failed, however, he had assiduously cultivated James and, by sycophancy and intrigue, had even worked his way into the Government. Though he had previously shown little attachment to any religion, during James' reign Sunderland feigned conversion to Catholicism in order more effectively to pursue his secular career.[42] Sunderland ingratiated himself with the guileless Petre[43] and, knowing that religion bulked largest in the minds of both the priest and the King, he at once began to advocate the adoption of strong measures to advance Catholicism. For the politician the situation was ideal. Petre, as a Jesuit, was fiercely detested by all Protestants. As a member of the Council he was a prominent public figure. Thus Sunderland could advocate any measure welcome to the ears of Petre or the King, certain that if it provoked a public uproar the blame would attach to the priest rather than to himself.

Shortly after James' accession Sunderland secured the royal consent to establish a secret board of prominent Catholics to watch over Catholic interests. With the exception of the moderate Catholic Lords Bellasis, Arundel, and Powis, this group uniformly pushed for bolder measures to advance the Catholic cause. Sunderland was even more vigilant to seek his personal fortune. Early in James' reign he, Petre, Tyrconnel (then Richard Talbot), and Henry Jermyn (later Lord Dover) made an agreement to aid one another to achieve their respective ambitions.[44] Sunderland later used Petre to help him secure the dismissal of Rochester as Treasurer, a position to which Sunderland succeeded, much to his own financial advantage.[45] In 1688 his true character was revealed. Sensing that

---

[42] Sheridan, *Stuart Papers*, VI, 3. It was typical of the man that in 1689 Sunderland should deny ever having been a Catholic; *Second Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, London, 1871, 16.

[43] Persons of such dissimilar views as Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 382; Foley, *Jesuit Records*, V, 275; Hilaire Belloc, *James the Second*, Philadelphia, 1928, 164; and J. S. Clarke, *The Life of James the Second*, London, 1816, II, 75–77, agree that Petre was a shield for Sunderland. Clarke wrote an "official" biography of James II from the personal and state papers of the Stuarts. For this work George III gave him the title "Historiographer to the King." He always presents James II in the best possible light.

[44] Sunderland was to become Treasurer; Talbot, Governor of Ireland; Jermyn, a peer and a captain of horse-guards; and Petre, a cardinal. Clarke, *James II*, II, 77.

[45] Macaulay, II, 55.

James was going too far, Sunderland advised him not to prosecute the recalcitrant bishops.[46] Meanwhile, in order to insure his own position under a possible new regime, he had begun a treasonable correspondense with William of Orange.[47]

The type of advice these "extremists" regularly gave the King may be judged from the admonitions addressed to him in 1685 by Tyrconnel, Castlemaine, Dover and Albeville. In Macaulay's words:

> They told their master that he owed it to his religion and to the dignity of the crown to stand firm against the outcry of heretical demagogues, and to let parliament see from the first that he would be master in spite of opposition, and that the only effect of opposition would be to make him a hard master.[48]

The motives of these parties were various. The clergy, and especially the Jesuits, were naturally interested primarily in taking advantage of a Catholic reign to spread their religion in a land which was, in their eyes, teeming with heretics. Barillon and the other envoys of France sincerely desired to aid the Catholic cause but were more concerned to keep England internally disunited and in the political van of France. Sunderland and the politicians were exercised chiefly to pour welcome advice into the royal ear in hope of securing favors for themselves.

The only common denominator among all these "extremists" was lack of political sagacity. All of them lived in an aura of fear, both for the welfare of their religion and for their personal safety. Due to the state of the King's health all of them were possessed by a strong sense of urgency, of time running out. In the period 1686–1688 James was in his fifties, growing senile, and without a Catholic heir. Though he was married to a youthful Catholic princess, it was commonly assumed that the royal couple would have no more children[49] and that James would be succeeded by Mary or Anne, his Protestant daughters by a previous marriage. Thus everyone expected his reign to be but a brief interlude in an otherwise unbroken Protestant succession. From this assumption his advisers concluded that they must act swiftly and decisively to liberate Catholics from their legal bonds and to establish the Church securely before the King went to his grave. Some of them spent much

---

46 *Ibid.*, II, 253.
47 Burnet, II, 498.
48 Macaulay, II, 46.
49 James had always lived the life of a libertine and by this time was probably suffering from paresis; Turner, *James II*, 234. Queen Mary Beatrice had given birth to four children before 1688 but all had died.

time weaving unlikely schemes to safeguard themselves and their creed in England. James was repeatedly urged by some to will his kingdom to Louis XIV, while others favored Tyrconnel's plan to separate Ireland from England and place it under French rule at James' death.[50] Various proposals were offered for changing the succession to the throne.[51] A French agent, Bonrepaus, produced the most novel suggestion: that the Princess Anne, second in line for the throne, and her husband be converted to Catholicism[52]—though he did not explain how this was to be achieved. The chimerical character of these projects testifies to the sense of desperation in the hearts of their authors.

The great majority of the English Catholics, however, shared none of these illusions or ambitions. As noted before, decades of persecution had left them bowed, timorous, and keenly aware of both the strength of Protestantism and the vigor of its animosity towards all things Catholic. Though they valued their religion as highly as did the court zealots (and had proved this by remaining Catholic) they had long since abandoned hope of converting England. By 1685 they wanted little save to be left alone. Like the "extremists" they expected the days of James II to be short. They hoped for a mild, peaceful reign so that whatever Protestant ruler followed James would not be unkindly disposed towards them. They would have been satisfied if James had secured the repeal of the penal laws, granted them the right to worship privately in their houses, and persuaded parliament to guarantee that they would not be deprived of their property.[53] They hoped that such moderate concessions as these coupled with exemplary behavior by themselves would convince even the most suspicious of their Protestant countrymen that a Catholic could be a good citizen and worthy of better treatment by the nation.[54]

---

50 Macaulay, II, 220–221.

51 One such scheme was to set up the bastard son of James and Arabella Churchill as a rival of William of Orange and Mary, the King's eldest daughter and first in line for the throne; *Ibid.*, II, 234.

52 Reresby, *Memoirs*, 404. Bonrepaus had no diplomatic title. His business in England was to try to persuade Huguenots who had fled from the persecution of Louis XIV to return to France; Ruth Clark, Trumbull, 69.

53 Turner, *James II*, 351–352; von Ranke, IV, 227; Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 59. Burnet records that in 1688 English lay Catholics, the Holy Roman Emperor, and even the Pope evinced satisfaction with the terms of a letter published by Fagel, the Grand Pensionary of Holland, setting forth William of Orange's religious recommendations for England. In it William advocated maintenance of the Test Act but repeal of the penal laws against Catholics and the grant of freedom to worship privately. Burnet, *op. cit.*, II, 458.

54 Turner, *ibid.*, 351–352.

This overall estimate of the situation was shared by the English Cardinal Howard, then residing in Rome,[55] by Pope Innocent XI, by Adda, the nuncio,[56] and by the Jesuit General.[57] Only the English and French sections of the Society of Jesus disdained to try for mere toleration, preferring to gamble for the conversion of England.[58]

Very soon after his accession to the throne the bulk of the English Catholics began to fear that the efforts of James II to aid their religion would more likely result in its destruction.[59] Each time the King embarked upon one of his precipitate courses Protestants feared for their liberties and Catholics trembled at the thought of the vengeance the Protestant majority might wreak on them when James was gone.[60] Thus, from the first, most English Catholics disliked and opposed royal measures which, superficially, appeared to be undertaken for their benefit.

When James outlined his plans for granting commissions in the army to Catholics, Lord Bellasis, Commissioner of the Treasury and a leader of the Catholic moderates, declared, "I date my ruin and that of my persuasion from this day."[61] The prorogation of parliament in 1686 so alarmed many propertied Catholics that they considered selling their lands and seeking refuge abroad.[62] While some Catholics accepted and even sought positions in the government, most of the gentry were reluctant to assume ostentatious positions, fearing that by so doing they would become instruments for

55 Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 370–371; Cardinal Howard to Monsignor L. Innes, August 30, 1688, *Publications of the Catholic Record Society*, XXV, 84–85. Neither the Pope nor Howard, his chief adviser on English affairs, believed that English Catholics were likely to gain power in the face of determined Protestant resistance. They sought, rather, to strengthen Catholicism internally, to correct the clerical laxity that had crept into the Church in England, and to make the Church sound and healthy so that in time Catholics might be enabled to win their rightful place in the state; Brady, *Annals*, 136; C. E. Raymund Palmer, *The Life of Philip Thomas Howard, O.P., Cardinal of Norfolk*, London, 1888, 200.

56 Turner, *James II*, 327; von Ranke, IV, 332; Adda's dispatches November 26 and December 31, 1685, cited in Macaulay, II, 47.

57 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 59; von Ranke, IV, 378.

58 Even the Jesuit Father Pollen admits that the Society bears a large share of the responsibility for James' unpopularity and downfall; John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., "Lord Macaulay and Father Petre," *The Month*, September, 1911, 209.

59 Barillon to Louis XIV, March 15, 1685, cited in Louis I. Bredvold, *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden*, Ann Arbor, 1934, 168.

60 This was an attitude James could never understand. Anyone who held it he regarded as a timorous compromiser; Terriesi's dispatch, April 29, 1687, cited the Bredvold, *Dryden*, 179. Terriesi was the Tuscan Ambassador to England. He was in close touch with the moderate faction and his dispatches are an important source of information concerning Catholic opinion and activity in the reign of James II.

61 Earl of Ailesbury, *Memoirs*, 126, cited in Bredvold, *Intellectual Milieu*, 172.

62 Terriesi's dispatch, March 11, 1686, cited in Bredvold, 176.

the folly of the court extremists. Thus one of the greatest difficulties the King encountered in his efforts to place Catholics in the administration was finding enough Catholics to fill the proferred positions.[63] Many Catholics remonstrated with James to abandon efforts to force their co-religionists into Oxford, urging the building of a national Jesuit college instead.[64] The elevation of Father Petre to the Privy Council and the appointment of Tyrconnel as commander of the Irish troops provoked dismay and vigorous objection among the Catholic moderates. Lords Bellasis, Dover, and Arundel made public speeches against Tyrconnel, Bellasis describing him as fool and madman enough to ruin ten kingdoms.[65] The Earl of Powis, another of the leaders of the Catholic moderates, implored the King not to allow Tyrconnel to carry out his plans forcibly to return Irish lands to their ancient owners.[66] As for Petre, by 1688 most Catholics had become convinced that his influence over the King could bring only ruin to their Church and themselves, consequently they despised him as heartily as did the Protestants.[67] Likewise, English Catholics for the most part resented the King's alliance with France quite as much as their Protestant countrymen.[68]

The moderates, too, consistently opposed any exercise of the royal dispensing power[69] in their behalf, when parliamentary concurrence was lacking. Action of this sort split king and parliament, and in such a division Protestants immediately identified parliament with constitutionality and legality and the Catholic King (and, indirectly, all Catholics) with absolutism and caprice. This was precisely what the moderate Catholics wanted, at all costs, to avoid. Their scrupulous regard for constitutionality was best illustrated in 1688 when the Anglican bishops drew up a petition to the King in which they explained their refusal to read the Second Declaration

---

63 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 435.

64 Macauley, II, 204.

65 Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 304; Bredvold, *Intellectual Milieu*, 177; Hume, *History of England*, VI, 319; Butler, *Historical Memoirs of Catholics Since the Reformation*, III, 99.

66 Hume, VI, 319.

67 Clarendon's Diary, December 20, 1688, cited in *Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, Including the Diary of Lord Clarendon*, ed., by Samuel Wells Singer, London, 1828, II, 232; Terriesi's dispatch, June 28, 1688, cited in Bredvold, *Intellectual Milieu*, 180; Lingard, X, 260, 378.

68 Blundell, *Letters*, 258.

69 The "dispensing power" was the right of the king to exempt an individual from a legal penalty or restriction. It has long been a prerogative of the English crown. James interpreted it so broadly that it became, in effect, a "suspending power," that is, the right of the king to enact and repeal laws on his own authority. As so interpreted it amounted to undisguised absolutism.

of Indulgence in their churches. James sent them to the Tower of London and had them tried for seditious libel, but his own Attorney-General, Lord Powis, conducted the trial as fairly as possible[70] and the bishops went free. Later in the year the queen gave birth to a son, an event which catalyzed all the growing opposition to James as it opened the prospect of an indefinite continuance of Catholic rule. The King then sought to pack parliament so as to assure his son of the succession. Protestants and Catholics alike cried out against this violation of the law, and James' own hand-picked sheriffs refused to return any but the lawful representatives.[71] In the face of the Dutch invasion in the late autumn of 1688 James summoned a great council of peers of the realm. The moderate Catholic lords joined with their Protestant counterparts in urging the King not to leave the country but to call parliament at once and assure his subjects that the law and the Established Church would be secured.[72] Had this advice been followed it is quite possible that James might have saved his throne.

After the King's flight some of his intemperate supporters in Ireland tried to build up popular support for him in England. Few English Catholics, however, harbored any hope of James' ultimate return or would consent to associate themselves with an effort to bring him back.[73]

Events, of course, proved the moderates to have been political realists. While the effort of James and his advisers to advance the cause of religious toleration in an intolerant age evokes a certain modern admiration[74] there can be no question that for English Catholicism James was a calamity. By failing to see that the ideally desirable was not the same as the politically possible the King and his rash counsellors bear a heavy responsibility for the continuation of the legal burdens which English Catholics bore for another one hundred and forty years.

BERNARD NORLING

University of Notre Dame

---

70 Burnet, *History of My Times*, II, 468. Coming from the Anglican bishop Burnet, who lived contemporaneously with the events described, this is a significant admission.

71 Macaulay, II, 225–226, 237.

72 Tresham Lever, *Godolphin: His Life and Times*, London, 1952, 69; Helen C. Foxcroft, *A Character of the Trimmer*, Cambridge, 1946, 258.

73 Blundell, *Letters*, 257. Neither Blundell nor his son would have anything to do with plans for armed defense of the King. Blundell says that only a few young men in Lancashire were serious supporters of James.

74 This is, of course, to give James all the benefit of the doubt. It is quite possible that his ultimate intention was to replace Protestant intolerance with Catholic intolerance; cf. *supra*, 1.

DOCUMENT

Father Piret Lands in New York, 1846

Introduction

Father Piret's journal is a document of the permanent collections on exhibit at the Fort Mackinac Museum, Mackinac Island, Michigan. Even though it deals with his experiences in the East, its location on Mackinac Island is no surprise since he spent a large part of his adult life on the Northern shores of Lakes Huron and Michigan as a missionary priest. A photograph of Piret in later life and several pieces of his personal silver are also on display. From the somewhat faded likeness can be recognized a man inflexible in principles but kindly and understanding of human nature and its failings. Hallmarks on his silver, four forks and seven spoons, identify it as being continental and having been variously made just before or after the turn of the eighteenth century.

Little is known of Andrew D. J. Piret's early life.[1] He was born in Belgium, around 1802. It is thought by many, probably because of his manners and bearing, that he came of wealthy and aristocratic lineage. Father Piret came to the Great Lakes prepared to minister to both the spiritual and physical wants of his predominantly Indian parishioners; to them he was both a priest and a physician, having studied medicine in Paris before being ordained a secular priest. His soubriquet, "Iron Head," translated literally from the Indian, probably meant "Man of Great Wisdom" to the Chippewa, Potawatomi, and Ottawa he served.

In the spring of 1846, Piret landed in New York City to take up his life in the New World. The novel scenes, rude manners of our busy pioneer ancestors and general excitement stimulated him to record his feelings and impressions for posterity. The fact that they were written on scraps of paper and margins of newspapers would seem to indicate that he wrote while inspired and unable at the moment to secure better material.[2]

---

[1] Mr. John T. Nevill of *The Evening News*, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, generously made his notes on Father Piret available for the preparation of this introduction.

[2] *Michigan History*, Vol. 6, 232.

The same year Father Piret landed in New York City he traveled to Albany *via* the Hudson River. Included in the journal is a graphic description of the River's majestic beauty as seen through his eyes. This trip was no doubt a part of his waterway journey to Detroit where he was soon assigned the responsibility of administering the twin missions of St. Ignace and Mackinac Island. His diocese included an expanse of territory from Detour to Manistique, in length almost 150 miles across Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

Around 1850, Father Piret moved from Mackinac Island to a piece of land he owned on the mainland just opposite Marquette Island, one of the Les Cheneaux Islands in Lake Huron. Though his missions were taken over by a younger priest, he continued to serve his extensive parish for almost twenty more years, using a sailboat in the summer and a dog-sled in the winter. It is said that each night he placed a lighted candle in his window as a beacon of welcome for lost and weary travellers in Michigan's north country.

In 1868 Father Piret's house and farm buildings burned to the ground. Shortly after that he moved to Cheboygan, Michigan, where he passed away on August 22, 1875.

A graphic delineation of Father Piret's personality, philosophy and religious endeavors can be found by reading Constance Fenimore Woolson's novel, *Anne,* first published in 1882. She is said to have known him personally while both were residents of Mackinac Island in the early post fur-trade era. Father Piret is featured in her book as "Father Michaux" who is cast in the multiple role of bishop, governor, judge and doctor.

While living in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan Piret exercised his intellectual capacities by corresponding with inquisitive individuals in other mission stations and colleges. His interests embraced plant and animal life, mineralogy, Indian customs and legends, and even recipes for sauces. His deep interest in scientific subjects is evidenced by his appearance before the zoological and mineralogical society of Washington, D. C.

The Piret journal was presented to the Mackinac Island State Park Commission in 1922 by Mrs. Brayton Saltonstall. She was the daughter of George W. Bell, of Cheboygan, Michigan, executor of Father Piret's will.

The location of the original manuscript on paper scraps is unknown. A transcription of the journal as written in French and its translation, have been preserved in a notebook that appears to be of the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The two versions

are obviously not in the same handwriting or even similar ink. The English rendition is dated June 20, 1902, and is no doubt the work of Brayton Saltonstall.[3] Whether the French portion of the manuscript was written by Father Piret or copied into it by someone else cannot be ascertained.

Saltonstall's translation was used for this presentation of the Piret journal. It was found completely acceptable when checked against the French by Miss Marion Tamin, Assistant Professor of French, Western Michigan College. Changes in punctuation and sentence structure made by the editor have been indicated in the usual manner. Nothing has been omitted except that portion of the journal dealing with Piret's description of the Hudson River below Albany. The latter was not included because, even though poetic, it adds nothing to our knowledge of life on the Eastern seaboard of the first half of the last century.

Father Piret's candle has long ceased to glimmer over the lonely stretches of Lake Huron. His journal, however, continues to illuminate his thoughts and impressions of New York City, Baltimore and Washington of one hundred ten years ago.

ALEXIS A. PRAUS

Kalamazoo Public Museum

Piret's Journal

My arrival in New York the last of May 1846.

The sentiments experienced by an European on setting foot for the first time upon American soil are inexpressible. Mine at least were so when I touched the land of liberty which I had so longed to see; this pleasure was all the greater for me because I had almost been deprived of it by a terrible storm, which subjected me to all the agony of an impending shipwreck! I was tempted to kiss everybody! It was a wild joy, but very sincere, because it came from the heart.

My baggage had hardly been deposited at the hotel, when I started to walk about the city, which according to the census of 1845 contained a population of 372,102 souls.

[3] *Michigan History,* Vol. 4, 512.

It is a mixture of all the population of Europe, but not of what constitutes its finest part.
This conglomeration of men, so unlike each other, formed of such heterogeneous elements, keeps the Police of New York upon edge, night and day.

At first the Americans must have formed a very sad idea of the people of the Old World! to judge from the samples which came to them from there!

One sees, in New York, structures of all kinds, because everyone builds there in the style of his own country, one can take, in a very short time a complete course in architecture and the history of the origin of Nations[;] it is a Babel of confusion of tongues.

At last, tired of running to and fro, I returned to form a more ample acquaintance with my chamber, but I was not comfortable there. I slept little and badly, it seemed to me as if I were still in the ship! my room was low, I suffocated. The Astor House resembles an elegant barracks, the lower part of the hotel does well enough[;] but the 400 sleeping rooms are villianous nests! as to comfort there is much to be desired and yet one pays two dollars and a half per diem.*

To see the physiognomy of the people of the morning as I had examined yesterday that of the people of the day and of the evening, I went out early, at break of day. What a concourse at the wharves of all these steamboats with sails, which disembark people and merchandise from all the countries of the world! going and coming in the streets and upon the markets, what a difference in costumes, this would be the moment to make a complete collection of the costumes of the people of all nations, all these rags and tatters which I pass in review have a very great value for a genuine amateur. What a sight all these people are!

I took breakfast with beings with features and manners of all sorts, very interesting indeed for a physiognomist, a caricaturist or a linguist. Some ate, other devoured! very few with relish.

What whims in the tastes of men! This one puts sugar with his eggs! his *vis-à-vis* broke four of them in the tumbler! this is not very pleasing I do not know why! if one examines the one who is

* The author, a stranger to the American coinage evidently falls into an error in converting the hotel rate into its French equivalent. He says ten franks and fifty centimes or $2.10, an unlikely rate. It was doubtless $2.50 or twelve franks and fifty centimes; Brayton Saltonstall.

eating them it is still worse, he has a thick unkept beard of a reddish yellow shade such as I have seen among the Baskirs, a beard which he covers insensibly with his eggs!

Another mixes cream with his goose berries, who has a neighbor who eats them with syrup, but of all exorbitant customs, I saw one who salted his coffee! either it was a man half dead from improper living or else an excentric [*sic*]. In the distance I perceived one who ate everything, more or less, with the fingers! The fork here, it is true, is almost a useless piece of furniture, it has only two long large tines, very far apart and serves only to push the morsels upon the round point of a large knife.

I saw not far from me to the left two very curious individuals—the first works the jaw with the rapidity of machinery, the second hardly opens it to allow the food to pass, he chews nothing, one would say he is a ruminant[.] His neighbor appears to think so, or else he says to himself in the words of Broussair[,] "the stomach is an indefinable creature." If I knew the language well and permitted myself, I would be tempted to engage myself for a month as a waiter, what a fine plan to see everything well, what a pretty album I would make.

In the course of the day I made a visit to Mr. Mally, Belgian consul, who received me politely, no doubt in my capacity as bearer of despatches. [H]e put his barn at my disposal for storing my baggage till my return from Washington.

In the afternoon toward evening the youngest of the brothers (for there are three) came to take me for a walk with him, after which he took me to supper at one of those Oyster Houses such as there are at Ostende. [T]he Oysters served us, in a very pretty room, I vow, were very large! I prefer those of Ostende. The party over, he escorted me to my hotel where we shook each other by the hand like two friends who would pass some time without seeing each other! The following day I got away for Washington. [T]owards seven o'clock I boarded a steamboat called a Ferry boat which landed me presently in New Jersey. [Here] I took the railroad to speed by machinery towards the Capital of the United States across the states of New Jersey, Pensylvania, [sic] Deleware [sic], Maryland and the District of Columbia which touches Virginia. This long journey was accomplished without accident [;] now on a steamer, now by rail, through swamps[,] valleys, mountains, forests, fields of wheat, tobacco, corn, Orchards, meadows, all

dotted with Cities, towns, villages, farms [and] cottages. Philadelphia, capital of Pensylvania, [sic] . . . . is a magnificent city with wide streets laid out as straight as a string, ornamented with trees having beautiful houses[,] fine covered markets, an academy of medicine, a college bearing the name of Girard. [He was] a Frenchman [who] become a millionaire from the poor man that he was[.] [He died] an atheist, I am told, [and] the Port of Philadelphia is his penitentiary.

This city which contains a population of 258,079 inhabitants is very flourishing, through its location on the Deleware [sic] river. Baltimore, the capital of Maryland has not like its neighbor, streets as wide nor as straight (and I congratulate it therefore) but it has something better than the well beloved City of Penn——a Charming and picturesque situation, more advantageous for commerce, located as it is upon the Chespeake [sic] (an arm of the Atlantic). [I]ts population is 134,379 inhabitants.

Baltimore has an arch bishopric, a good college directed by the Catholic clergy and boarding schools for young ladies directed by the Sisters. Washington is not remarkable except for the name it bears. Its Capital (rotunda after the order of that of the Botanical garden of Brussels) is a monument of rather pretty style. [T]hat which beautifies it greatly is the immense lawn cut up with paths and ornamented with magnificent trees here and there. [P]laced above this piece of verdure the edifice looks well. It is the house of the representatives of the Nation. [O]ne notes also quite a fine library, some paintings and several statues, the work of artists of the Old World. At the foot of the monument is found a fountain, properly arranged, which pours its water into a basin near which is [a] large cup fastened to an iron chain fixed in the wall for use of the public who wish to drink. The residency of the President of "America" has nothing remarkable about it, no more than the other public buildings—Oh yes! I was forgetting that Washington, located upon the Potomac, a beautiful river I own, is very favorably situated for commence. Its population is only 33,745 inhabitants.

Still another very grave oversight! It is here that all the great European Diplomats reside. Really I am going to be forced to admit that the City of Washington is celebrated for more than one reason, through force of a train of circumstances[.] A few miles from Washington is Georgetown separated from the District of

Columbia by the Potomac, a charming, picturesque place renowned for a college of Jesuits and a fine boarding school, directed by the Dames du sacré coeur.

I was received very politely indeed by Colonel De Beauliere[,] our chargé d'affaires, to whom I delivered the despatches of which I was the bearer. We took tea together. He returned my visit at the hotel where I was stopping. [H]is wife was very kind to me, but neither the one nor the other, any more than the consul, knew that I was a priest!

Mr. Polk[,] president of the United States had the courtesy to converse with me for more than an hour about our little Belgium, of its liberal constitution, the industry of its inhabitants, of the wisdom of its King, the products of the country and its commercial relations with America. [A]nd then he very kindly gave valuable directions and information upon the United States. He invited me to call again and his last words were—"You must become an american citizen Mr. Piret, it is among us that your place is marked out, here you will be in your element" and he pressed my hand between both of his in the most affectionate manner.

Having some letters of introduction to prominent men I began to seek out their residences and by all of them I was graciously received. The president of the Zoological and Mineralogical Society received with joy a little collection of specimens which I had to offer to the government on the part of a learned society of Belgium. Honorable mention and thanks were voted at a public meeting and ordered printed. [I]t was then that the president in the name of his worthy colleagues made me a present of a beautiful volume. [O]ur "Chargé d'affaires" did as much. [I]t was very flattering for me. [A]t last, every thing finished, my mission accomplished, I regained New York by another route which offered nothing remarkable.

Book Reviews

Man and Land in Peru. By Thomas R. Ford. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, 1955. Pp. ix, 176. $4.00.

In essaying to write on Peruvian man-land relationships from the Incas to Odría, Professor Ford, a sociologist, assumed a large and difficult task. While he devotes but one chapter to the history of his subject, he recognizes throughout his work the necessity of looking at the present through the lens of the past in the slow-changing Indian world of Peru. In his use of this approach lie both the strength and weakness of the book.

The result of this synthesis, necessarily oversimplified here, comes to something like this: The Indian agricultural workers were oppressed under the Inca system of extreme collectivism, but they were submissive because of a thorough process of social and cultural unification. In the long colonial period, the Spanish government enacted beneficent legislation to protect the property and other rights of the Indian farmer, but it was almost totally ineffective to prevent the rise of a rural proletariat. Nor was the Spanish settler willing or even interested in bringing the Indian into his new individualistic economy his equal as an economic man. As a result there was only a partial fusion of the two cultures which continued to live uneasily side-by-side down to the revolutions. The republican era with its confusion, civil turmoil, and war, simply eliminated whatever effective containment there had been upon the exploitation of the Indian and the expropriation of his land despite the well-meaning legislation of San Martín, Bolívar, and others.

That is the state of the vast majority of the Peruvian farmers today. Without advertising to the extremely unequal distribution of the land, Professor Ford finds that the amount of cultivated soil per individual averages less than half an acre. They work the land as renters, sharecroppers, or laborers on large private or corporate estates where they receive subsistence only or token wages running as high as fifteen cents a day additionally. The total annual income of the majority of individuals averages between twenty-five and fifty dollars per year.

The author suggests no panaceas, but he does have hope. He rejects out-of-hand any concept of "innate ineptitude" in the Peruvian Indian that would make him unresponsive to the economic good. But centuries of indifference or exploitation by masters who were themselves not interested in better results have contributed to his indolence and indifference. The statistics on disease, malnutrition, and the consumption of coca and alcohol tell the rest of the story. With new avenues of knowledge developing, however, and new ideas sifting through to these people the change will come. The first step will be organization. Unfortunately at this point, Ford looks back nostalgically for inspiration to the days of González Prada, Mariátegui, and Haya de la Torre, the anarchists and Marxists of recent Peruvian history who developed the Indianist cult called APRA.

Ford frankly admits the limitations of his current data and uses it cautiously. His care is much less apparent in his handling of the Spanish materials where his conclusions are stated with finality. The fact is that there has been no monographic work done on the Spanish period comparable to Zavala's in Mexico on this subject. The documents are lying in the Archivo de la Hacienda or burned and water soaked in the Biblioteca Nacional of Lima or scattered in archives in Chile and Spain. It would be interesting to find out the details of Indian life on the Jesuit Lands whose confiscation in 1767 the author views with apparent approval. What happened to the schools, the colleges, hospitals and charitable institutions they supported? What happened to the lands after confiscation? Were they distributed to the Indians? These, of course, are questions for the historian.

PAUL S. LIETZ

Loyola University, Chicago

The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters. By Bernard Duffey. Michigan State College Press, 1954. Pp. 285. $6.50.

Among Michigan State College's *Studies in Language and Literature* is *The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters.* Many of the numerous books on Chicago which have appeared in recent years, including Emmet Dedmon's (probably the best of these), have treated "Chicago writers" of the last century in some fashion or other. Mr. Duffey, however, has given all readers interested in modern American literature a valuable study of these writers.

He has considered from a serious and objective viewpoint writers as early and as different as Eugene Field and Hamlin Garland. He has proceeded through authors such as Robert Herrick, Edgar Lee Masters, and Vachel Lindsay to Vincent Starrett, Ben Hecht and other contemporaries, not forgetting a good chronicle of *Poetry's* editors and contributors—the one living *poetry* magazine in the world with forty-three years of continued existence. This book is a very useful guide to the "Chicago Renaissance." It is a sincere and readable study of important and influential writers in the literary history of middle-America and of "America at large."

NORMAN WEYAND

Loyola University, Chicago

The Campaign for the Sugar Islands 1759, A Study of Amphibious Warfare. By Marshall Smelser. Foreword by Samuel Eliot Morison. Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1955. Pp. xii, 212. $5.00.

This book is remarkable for its neatness. It is neatly organized, neatly and interestingly written and neat in format and printing. The incident of the British occupation of the Sugar Islands in 1759, well set on the broad

canvas of the great Anglo-British wars for empire in the eighteenth century, is illustrative of the international scheming in politics, the widespread struggle for world trade products, and the place of the soldier and seaman in the designs of the London directors of economic imperialism. To this extent the conquest of the few small islands looms larger than what the title of the book might imply, namely, a detailed account of the first amphibious attack in more modern times. Professor Smelser has fashioned his narrative chiefly from official, executive documents and from memoirs and records of officers who engaged in the West Indian campaign.

In his introduction Professor Smelser, describing the many areas of conflict between France and England, points particularly to the alarm of the British in the 1750's over the French sugar production and slave trade in the West Indies, which bade fair to ruin British trade, and to the French capture of Minorca in the Mediterranian, which was strategically important to British plans in Europe. William Pitt rose to the challenge of the British defeats. He organized parliamentary and popular thought to give England a series of victories. One of these was the capture of the Sugar Islands by daring. Pitt's purpose in launching the amphibious attack was to use Guadeloupe or Martinique in a trade for Minorca, though another powerful motive was to close Martinique as a base for French privateers who had already taken 1,400 British merchantmen.

In 1758 the army of the tropics numbering 9,000 was "organized" under Major General Peregrine Thomas Hopson, the marines were under Captain John Moore, the fleet was under Commodore Robert Hughes, but beyond this confusion reigned. Some of the elements that have made the comic opera *Pinafore* amusing appeared in the launching of the ships, and Professor Smelser is not without humor in his story of the voyage, what with such items to discuss as emeritus transports, straying ships, missing soldiers and officers, and the French knowledge of the assembling and whereto of the expedition. The minute, scholarly, account of the attack on Martinique reveals expert inefficiency on both the French and British sides, and the whole would be laughable if some of the men had not got killed or become sick before the British decided to withdraw.

The move on the next objectives, the two parts of the island of Guadeloupe, takes up four chapters of the book. The few forts were pitiably weak in men and ammunition. The first attack began on January 23, 1759, with bombardments before landings on Basse Terre; on May 1 the other part of the island, Capesterre, capitulated, just at the time the British were making up their minds to withdraw because of illness and losses. The results of the three months campaign are given in a chapter euphemistically headed "The Campaign as a Work of Art." Britain rejoiced in a great victory and Guadeloupe was returned to France for French recognition of the Mississippi as the western boundary of the British colonies. There is a bibliography, an appendix defining terms, and a good index.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

Vichy Political Dilemma. By Paul Farmer. New York, Columbia University Press, 1955. Pp. vi, 376. $5.00.

Few more depressing scenes emerge from the pages of modern history than the 20th century failure of French institutional vitality and dynamism. Mr. Farmer in this trenchant and charitable study of France under the Vichy regime has carefully connected the wartime government of Marshal Henri Pétain with the objectiveless years of the Third Republic. All areas of French life in the interwar period reflected a pessimism and lack of purpose that were ultimately to result in the tragedy of June, 1940. Not neglecting economic and social problems the author rightly maintains that the real decline of France is to be traced in terms of the constitutional problem of lack of governmental stability. The Third Republic had from its inception encountered political factionalism of the most self-seeking variety. More than anywhere in the West the liberal parliamentarianism of the French government with its impotent executive represented the paralysis of overly representative institutions. Impotency was resolved by intrigue and intrigue begot not statesmanship but the delicate art of political survival regardless of principle.

The unique value of this work is to be found in its treatment of the Vichy regime as an integral part of the history of modern France and as an objective analysis of the internal character and purpose of that government. Vichy created little of permanence and yet the Fourth Republic is not an exact replica of the Third. It is not without significance that the corporative, anti-individualist tendencies of Vichy were not discredited by defeat. Nor is there an essential difference between those who in 1941 held that France could best serve her interests by not attaching herself to either the Allied or Axis cause and today's exponents of neutralism.

The author makes clear that those who surrendered in 1940 were men reflective of a parliamentary system that advanced those who would compromise and retired those with conviction. However, the course they chose if open to question on the grounds of wisdom cannot be termed dishonorable. Three figures dominated the pre-armistice discussions. Reynaud, who would fight on but who was responsible for bringing both Pétain and Weygand into the cabinet; Weygand, who was present "to defend the honor of the French army" and who refused to allow the government to take up exile while the army assumed the onus of surrender; and Churchill, who continually undercut Reynaud's position by failing to insist that the French cabinet honor its solemn pledges.

Mr. Farmer traces the erosion of Vichy's independence culminating in the final extinction of sovereignty with the German occupation of Southern France in November, 1942. The story is traced to its conclusion through the following two years of complete collaboration by the Vichy government. The ease with which Pétain accepted the new situation is indicative that the regime's initial purpose of protecting a defeated France had given way to a position of inability to act unhappily reminiscent of the Third Republic.

What moral may we draw from the tragedy of Vichy? Most Vichyites were convinced they served the best interests of their nation. Are we to

ascribe their failure simply to the fact that they did not change their position when their national interests were no longer served by their position? Perhaps Mr. Farmer's is the best answer to these questions: "Is it not evident that the fault of such men is not that they were lacking in patriotism, but that patriotism was not enough? Does it not appear that they went to their undoing, not because they failed to recognize the interests of their nation or did not dedicate themselves to those interests, but because they recognized no higher obligation."

EDMUND W. KEARNEY

John Carroll University

Notes and Comments

What has all the earmarks of a fine contribution to bibliography came from Spain at the beginning of this year. It is *Bibliografia Historica de España e Hispanoamerica,* Volume I, 1953–1954, under the more general heading of *Indice Historico Español,* which includes bibliographies on art, literature, culture and various disciplines besides history. The editing and compiling of this volume were done by the Centro de Estudios Historicos Internationales of the University of Barcelona under the direction of Professor Jaime Vicens Vives and the editorial secretary, David Romano Ventura. The remarkable task of editing results in a well-classified compilation of 6871 titles of books on Spanish and Spanish American history published during the past few years over the world. After each book listed at least one reviewer's opinion of the book is given with the date and place of the review. The twenty-three page, small type introduction by Professor Vives explains the nature and plan of the work. There are two indexes, one of authors of books and of reviews on green paper and the other of topics or materials on yellow paper. With these the pages run to 859. There seems to be very few typographical errors in this remarkably useful volume.

* * * *

Walt Whitman's Concept of the American Common Man, by Leadie M. Clark, was published this year by Philosophical Library, New York. This book of 171 pages, a devastating attack on Whitman's concepts and principles, will arouse the ire of the poet's worshipers, even though Mr. Clark grants to Whitman the poetic qualities which have gained him a name in American literature. "For Whitman was not a thinker; he was a lyric poet." (P. 168.) Mr. Clark gathers his evidence from the writings of Whitman and shows rather conclusively that the self-styled "poet of Democracy" had day to day opinions on people and events, fashioned out of no set of fundamental principles, "But for no major problem of his age can one go to Whitman for a proposed solution." (P. 33.) He points out that Whitman's reading on economic theory, of which there is no evidence in his writings, was "vague and indefinite," and "If America had attempted to follow the economic and political

theories of Whitman, she would have foundered for want of a consistent plan." (P. 43.) The Indian, Whitman thought, should vanish; so should the Negro, especially since slaves took away rights of whites to work; the Irish were "foreign outcasts and bullies prompted by this fanatical wretch (Bishop Hughes) and his slaves" and so Whitman condoned Know Nothing violence (Pp. 72–73); he was intolerant of Catholics; he liked German moderation; he thought Italy had art and music but he did not care for Italians; in all this he was "not the unqualified lover of all mankind." When Mr. Clark analyzes him as a representative democrat and contrasts Whitman's idea of what the American common man was, we find Whitman a romanticist and a prophet of a milieu of racial superiority for Anglo-Saxons, revitalized in an American setting. The book has a bibliography and index, and a list price of $3.75.

* * * *

The story of Jerome Increase Case and the J. I. Case Company has been told by Stewart E. Holbrook in the book *Machines of Plenty* with an alternate heading: Pioneering in American Agriculture. It was published in June of this year by The Macmillan Company and is listed at four dollars. Among the thousands of people streaming into the western plains during the 1840s was young J. I. Case (1819–1891) who became a world-known industrialist through the manufacturing of machines for agricultural usage, particularly the threshing machine. Case's idea of the thresher-separator was not original, nor could the inventions that regularly improved the machine be called his, but, according to Holbrook, Case was honest enough to buy patents and inventions rather than infringe on the rights of others. (P. 33.) Since it appears that the personality of Case is not glamorous, and much less the personality of a manufacturing plant or company, Mr. Holbrook digresses repeatedly on persons, places, and events, even to a chapter on lightning-rod agents and humbuggery. The style is journalistic, and the attempt to give the history of a large company in the setting of the last hundred years of vast agricultural progress resolves itself necssarily into a sketchy outline.

* * * *

The nations of the world, it is a truism, would come to live in happy concord if they would formulate and abide by a set of prin-

ciples of action in their dealings with one another. Each nation should have a foreign policy codified to such extent that successive administrations or governments in their foreign relations cannot suddenly veer on an altogether different tack from that followed by their predecessors. To show how such an ideal is not being upheld and how it might be is the general purpose of Professor Feliks Gross in his *Foreign Policy Analysis,* published by Philosophical Library, New York, in 1954. The author uses what he terms a scientific method of analyzing foreign policy, which method emerges in some complex, algebraic formulae that will leave the reader baffled and assuredly will not be clear to any ministers of foreign affairs. This scientific analysis is the first to be made with the "tools offered by modern social science," and the first to be based on the idea that foreign policy is a social process with social causation. The scientific method as applied seems, at least to this scribe, to mean that if our statesmen wish to form a permanent foreign policy, they will have to study first our American culture, ideology, politics, national interests and objectives, our philosophy of international relations. This type of study would involve the foreign policy maker in no end of reading. Yet this would only be background. Professor Gross would have your statesmen weigh each and all national factors which contribute to the formation of a policy: the geographic, economic, population, military, social-political, social-psychological, and a Factor X. After these have been evaluated there would be need for a similar study of each and every nation with whom we are to be related. Such a research method would establish a permanent formula for the conduct of our international affairs and would eliminate haphazard and expedient policies. Moreover, by applying the algebraic formulae, one would be able to predict what course a country like Russia might follow. The book is not casual reading.

INDEX

MID-AMERICA

VOLUME XXXVII

INDEXER'S NOTE

Names of the contributors are in small capitals; titles of articles in this volume are in quotation marks; titles of books and periodicals reviewed or mentioned are in italics. Book reviews are entered under author and title of book, and under the name of the reviewer; no entries are made for subject of the book except in the case of biographies. The following abbreviations are used: tr., translator; ed., editor; revs., reviews; revd., reviewed.

Abolitionists, 3–30
Acton on History, by L. Kochan, revd., 177
Aguilera, Francisco, ed., *Handbook of Latin American Studies: 1951,* noted, 60
Agurto, Bishop Pedro de, 160
A History of St. Ignatius Mission, by W. L. Davis, noted, 61
A History of the Southern Confederacy, by C. Eaton, revd., 56–57
Alabama, 31–47; white migration in, 31–35; lynching, 47; social conditions, 35–47
Albeville, Marquess of, 220, 224
Alcalá, University of, 141
Alcina, Fr. Francisco, 165
Amarillo Register, 54.
Amarillo, Texas, records in, 48–55
"An Episcopal Contribution to History," by PETER J. RAHILL, 48–55
Angle, Paul M., work noted, 64
Anglo-Spanish Convention of 1823, 92–93
Anzer, Helen, 53
Arango, D. Francisco, 73
Archer, M., 41
Arkansas Territory, 110
Army, Confederate, 171–175
Army Officers, U. S., 1790–1814; commissions, 101; training, 102; wardrobe, 103; salaries, 104–105; offices, 106–109; discipline, 109–112; military agents, 113–119; medical staff, 119–128; enlisted men, 196–204
Articles of War, 102
Arundel, Lord, 223, 227; see Howard
Augustinians, 153–170
Avellaneda, Fr. Diego de, 141, 144.
Bellarmine, Robert, Cardinal, 160
Belmont, August, 27
Benjamin, Judah P., 17
Bagot, Sir Charles, 82, 98
Baily, Francis, cited, 123
Bald, F. Clever, *Michigan in Four Centuries,* revd., 178–179
Baltimore, description of, 243
Barillon, Count, 221, 224
Barlow, Samuel L. M., 27
Baton Rouge, 198, 200, 203
Belknap, William, 210
Bellasis, Lord, 223, 226, 227
Benedictine Order, 217
Berkeley, Lord, 218
Bibliografia Historica de España e Hispanoamerica, noted, 241
Birmingham, Ala., 32
Birmingham News, 34
Bisayan language, 154, 159, 160
Bissell, Capt. Daniel, case of, 106, 111–112
Black Belt of Alabama, 31–41
Blair mission, 28, 29
BLAISDELL, LOWELL L., "The Consul in a Crisis: Lower California, 1911," 131–139
Blied, Benjamin J., *Three Archbishops,* noted, 188
Board of Trade, British, 88, 91
Bolton, Herbert E., cited, 158
Bonnecamp, Fr. Joseph de, 186
BOOK REVIEWS, 56–59, 176–183, 236–240
Boston Pilot, 208–209, 214
Boutwell, George S., 25
Bradburg, Charles, cited, 123
"Britain and Direct Spanish-American Trade 1815–1825," by BERNADINE PIETRASZEK, 67–100 (Error in title—1925 should be 1825)

Brooklyn Catholic Review, 212
Brougham, Lord, 71
Brouillet, Fr. J. B., 212
Brown, Elsie, ed. *Handbook of Hispanic American Studies*, 1953, noted 60–61
Bruyas, Fr. James, 185–186
Bull Run, first battle, 12
Burnet, Bishop, 217, 220, 221
Burnside, Gen. Ambrose, 22–24
Burwell, L. L., 41
BURRUS, ERNEST J., "Pedro de Mercado and Mexican Jesuit Recruits," 140–152; his *Kino Reports to Headquarters*, revd., 58–59
Butler, Lt. Col. Thomas, 112, 197

Cádiz Council of, 78, 95
Cagayan language, 153, 157, 158, 161, 164
CALDWELL, NORMAN W., "The Frontier Army Officer, 1794–1814," 101–108; "The Enlisted Soldier at the Frontier Post, 1790–1814," 196–204
California, Lower, 131–139
Campion, Fr. Juan A., 160
Canning, George, 79, 84–100
Cape Girardeau, 114
Carmelite Order, 217
Carrington, Col. H. B., 17
Carroll, John, cited, 48
Casa Profesa, Mexico, 144–145
Castañeda, Carlos E., 49
Castilian language, in Philippines, 166–170
Castillo, Fr. Sebastián, 161
Castlemaine, Earl, see Roger Palmer
Castlereagh, Lord, and Spain, 67–85, 99
Catholics, and James II, 215–228
Catholic Church, history records in Texas, 48–55
Catholic Mirror, 209–210
"Catholic Press Reaction to the Custer Disaster," by MARIE LOUISE SCHULTE, 205–214
Catholic Review, 213
Catholic Universe Bulletin, 209–210
Cebu, 154, 157, 160, 161
Cevallos, Don Pedro, 69, 70, 72, 73
Champion of Reform, Abad y Queipo, by Lillian E. Fisher, revd., 182–183
Charles II, 215, 216
Chase, Salmon P., 4
Chicago, Democratic Convention of 1864, 26
Chicago History, noted, 64
Chicago Times, 8
Chicago Tribune, 209
Chirino, Pedro, 160
Church of England, 215–228
Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph, 209–210, 212–213
Clark, J. Ruben, 132
Clark, Leadie M., *Walt Whitman's Concept of the American Common Man*, noted, 241
Civil War, politics, 3–30
Colfax, Schuyler, 25
Colorado R., dikes, 132, 134
Colored Servant Girl, 44
Columbus, see Ohio
Commercial interests, British in Spanish America, 67–101
Congress of Verona, 90
Connecticut Catholic, 210–211
"Contemporary English Catholics and the Policies of James II," by BERNARD NORLING, 215–228
Converse, George, 16
"Copperheads", 3, 6
Cortes, Spanish, 82, 92–93, 99
Corpus Christi, Texas, archives, 51
Councill, William P., cited, 38
Council of Indies, 70, 77, 78
Council of State, Spanish, 71–74, 84
Court, William A., 86–87, 88, 90–91, 97–98
Cox, Samuel Sullivan "Sunset", 3–30
Crazy Horse, 205
Crook, Gen. George, 205, 206
Curiel, Fr. Juan, 142
Curtis, A. H., 41
Custer, Gen. George, 205–214

d'Adda, Count Ferdinand, 217, 226
Dakotas, 205–208
Dallas, Texas, archives, 51
Davis, Fr. William L., *A History of St. Ignatius Mission*, noted, 61
Dearborn, Henry, Secretary of War, 104
Declaration of Indulgence, 215, 222
Dell, Harry, 136
Democrat Party, moderates, 1861–1865, 3–30
Demopolis, Alabama, 34
d'Este, Rinaldo, 220
De Polignac, Prince, 94–98
Department of State, 131–139
Detroit, 199
Díaz, Porfirio, 132, 133
Dictionary of Last Words, by E. S. LeComte, noted, 62
Dictionary of Linguistics, by M. A. Pei and F. Gaynor, noted, 61
"Dollar Diplomacy," 132
Dominican Friars, 140, 142, 154, 157, 159, 161, 164
Douglas, Stephan A., 3, 4, 8, 9

Dover, Lord, see Jermyn
Doyle, Thomas, case of, 109–110
Drummond, James, Earl of Perth, 219
Dryden, John, 219
DuBois, W. E. B., cited, 37–38
Dubuis, Bishop Claude M., 51–52
Duffey, Bernard, *The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters*, revd., 237

Eaton, Clement, *A History of the Southern Confederacy*, revd., 56–57
El Amamo, Lower California, 135, 136, 138
Elliot, Robert Neal, Jr., *The Raleigh Register*, noted, 87
El Paso, Texas, archives, 51
Eight Years in Congress, S. S. Cox, cited, 30
Emancipation Proclamation, 17, 20
English, William H., 14
Ensenada, Lower California, 134–139
Estudios Americanos, noted, 190
Eutaw, Alabama, 31, 39
Eutaw Whig and Observer, 32
Evans, Estwick, cited, 123
Ewing, Charles, 212
Ezgverra, Fr. Domingo, 160

Farmer, Paul, *Vichy Political Dilemma*, revd., 239
"Father Piret Lands in New York, 1846," by ALEXIS A. PRAUS, 238–244
Ferdinand VII, and Britain, 67–100
Fillmore, Millard, 9
Fisher, Lillian E., *Champion of Reform Abad y Queipo*, revd., 182–183
FitzSimon, Bishop Laurence J., 48–55
Flores Magón, Ricardo, 133, 135, 136, 138
Foik, Fr. Paul J., 49
Ford, Thomas R., *Man and Land in Peru*, revd., 236
Foreign Enlistment Bill, 80
Foreign Policy Analysis, F. Gross, noted, 243
Fort Clark, 126
Fort Mackinac Museum, 229
Fort Madison, 108
Fort Massac, 106, 107, 111, 113, 125–127, 195
Fort Osage, 123
Fort Pickering, 113–114, 116
Fort Stoddert, 122
Fort Sumter, 6
Fort Wilkinson, 112
Franciscan Friars, 158, 159, 161, 167–168, 217, 222
Freeman's Journal, 206, 212
Frémont, John C., 26

Gadsden Purchase, 131, 132
Gaines, Capt. E. P., 105
Galveston, Texas, archives, 51
Garcia de León y Pizarro, José, 74–77
Garfield, James A., 20
GARGAN, EDWARD, revs. J. C. Malin, *On the Nature of History*, 176; L. Kochan, *Acton on History*, 177
Gibbon, Gen. John, 205, 206
Giddings, Joshua, 4, 10
Gomes, Fernão, 149
Gorossarri, Don José, 91
Grant, Pres. U. S., 26, 29, 207–211, 214
Graves, Robert, *The Cross and the Sword*, noted, 186
Gravier del Valle, Rafael, 82
Greeley, Horace, 26
Greensboro, Alabama, 31
Gross, Feliks, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, noted, 243
Guilday, Msgr. Peter, 48
Gunpowder Plot, 216
Gurley, John A., 12–14

Harrison, William H., 102
Harwell, Richard B., ed., *Stonewall Jackson and the Old Stonewall Brigade*, noted, 192
Havana, Cuba, 147, 149
Hay, John, 25
Habeus Corpus, suspended, 18–20, 23
Hale County, Alabama, 31, 34
Halstead, Murat, 14, 15
Hamtramck, Col. John F., 127
Handbook of Latin American Studies 1951, No. 17, noted, 60–61
Hanna, Charles A., cited, 184
Helena Herald, Montana, 205
Historical Records Survey, 54
History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century, Sister M. Justille McDonald, revd., 180
History of St. Meinrad Archabbey, A. Kleber, revd., 179
Holbrook, Stewart E., *Machines of Plenty*, noted, 242
Holman, William S., 7
Howard, Philip Thomas Cardinal, 226
Hunt, Seth, case of, 110
Hyslop and Co., 84

Ibanag, language, 153, 161, 164
Illinois, Democratic Convention, 24; fevers in, 120–121
Ilocano, language, 153, 159, 160
Indiana Territory, 204
Indiana University, publications, noted, 186
Indian Office, 205, 212
Innocent XI, Pope, 226
Irish Democrat, 210

JACOBSEN, JEROME V., revs., Lillian Fisher, *Champion of Reform, Manuel Abad y Queipo*, 182–183; M. Smelser, *The Campaign for the Sugar Islands, 1759*, 237–238; NOTES and COMMENTS, 60–64, 184–192, 240–244
James II, 215–228
Jermyn, Henry, Lord Dover, 223, 224, 227
Jesuits, in New Spain, 140–152; national origins of, 147–152; in Philippines, 157–160; and James II, 218, 220–227
Johnson, Andrew, 9
Johnson-Crittenden resolutions, 9, 10, 14–16, 21
Jogues, St. Isaac, 184–186

Kaskaskia, Illinois, land office, 108–114
KEARNEY, EDMUND W., revs., P. Farmer, *Vichy Political Dilemma*, 239
KENNY, LAURENCE J., "There's a Glory in the Name Ohio," 184–186
Kentucky, 196
Keogh, Capt. Myles, 212–214
Kino Reports to Headquarters, E. J. Burrus, revd., 58–59
Kleber, O.S.B., Albert, *The History of St. Meinrad Archabbey, revd.*, 179
Knox, Philander, 132–139
Kochan, Lionel, *Acton on History*, revd., 176
Kroll, Henry H., cited, 46–47
KUHN, A. F., revs., F. C. Bald, *Michigan in Four Centuries*, 178–179

Landsdowne, Marquess of, 80, 81
Lake Huron, missions, 230, 231
Lanman, Charles, 25
Lastarria, D. Miguel de, 73
Lavoie, Fr. Leo F., 52
Lecompton Constitution, 4
Lenoce, Fr. Vincenzo, 149
LIETZ, PAUL S., revs., T. R. Ford, *Man and Land in Peru*, 236
Lieuwen, Edwin, *Petroleum in Venezuela*, A History, noted, 188
Lillietayloe Land Co., Alabama, 34
Lincoln, Abraham, and opposition politics, 3–30
LINDSEY, DAVID, "Sunset Cox, Leader of Lincoln's Loyal Opposition, 1861–1865," 3–30
Linguistics, Philippine, 153–170
Little Big Horn R., 205–207
Liverpool, Earl of, 78, 98
Liverpool, Shopowners' Ass'n, 83
Livingston, Alabama, 31, 35–36
London Times, 93
López de Legazpi, Miguel, 153
Louis XIV, 215, 220, 222, 225
Louisiana Territory, 110, 114, 124
Louisville, Kentucky, 198
Louisville Courier Journal, 209
Lowe, John, merchant, 83–84, 93
Luzon, languages, 153–165

Machines of Plenty, Stewart E. Holbrook, noted, 242
Mackinac Island, 229
Mackintosh, Sir James, 94–95
Macomb, Alexander, *Martial Law*, 102
Madero, Francisco I, 133
Malay language, 153
Malin, James C., *On the Nature of History*, revd., 176; *The Contriving Brain and the Skillful Hand*, noted, 243
Marble, Manton, 22, 25, 28
Marion, Alabama, 31, 37, 41
Marschalk, Lt. Andrew, 106
Mary Beatrice, Queen, 221
McCall, James E., cited, 44, 45
McClellan, George B., 8, 12–14, 23–27
McDonald, Sr. M. Justille, *History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century*, revd., 180
McFarlane, James, 110
McMaster, James, cited, 206, 211, 212
Medary, Samuel, 7, 22, 27
Melfort, Lord, 219
MENTAG, JOHN, revs. *The History of St. Meinrad Archabbey*, 179
Mercado, Fr. Pedro de, 140–152
Metternich, Prince von, 90
Mexico, colonial, 140–152; revolution of 1910, 132; and United States, 131–139
Meyers, Mrs. Nellie, 136
Michigan, Fr. Piret in, 229–232
Michigan In Four Centuries, F. C. Bald, revd., 178
Michoacán, 143, 144, 146, 147

Mississippi Territory, 110, 203
Mobile, Alabama, 122
Molina, Alonso de, 156
Monroe Doctrine, 133
Montemar, Duke of, 73
Montgomery, Alabama, 31, 35, 42
Montgomery Advertiser, 44
Montgomery Herald, 46
Montoya, Fr. Juan de, 161
Montúfar, Bishop Alonzo de, 142
Morelia, 144, 146
Morant, D. Rafael, 76, 78
Múñoz de Obregón, Hernán, 145
Murray, Robert K., *Red Scare, A Study in National Hysteria*, noted, 187

Natchez, 199
Natchez-Nashville Pike, 197
Navigation Act, 85–86
Nebraska History, noted, 190
New England abolitionists, 10, 20
New Orleans, 198
New Spain, 140–152
New York City, 1846, 238, 229–237
New York Sun, 206
New York World, 22, 24
NIXON, H. C., revs. A History of the Southern Confederacy, 56–57
NORLING, BERNARD, "Contemporary English Catholics and the Policies of James II," 215–228
Northwest Territory, 204
NOTES AND COMMENTS, 60–64, 184–190, 241–244
Nugent, Lord, 80
Núñez, D. Fernán, 72, 75

Oates, Titus, 217
Oaxaca, 144, 146, 147
Odin, Bishop John M., 51, 52
Ohio, name of, 184–186; politics, 1860–1865, 3, 5, 10, 14–30
Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, noted, 63
Ohio State Journal, 16, 23
Ohio Statesman, 4
Olds, Edison, 19
Oliver, Fr. Juan de, 161
Onís, Luis de, 74, 84, 90
On the Nature of History, J. C. Malin, revd., 176
Order of St. Augustine, see Augustinians
Order of St. Dominic, see Dominican Friars
Order of Friars Minor, see Franciscans
O'Reilly, John Boyle, 214
Otomí Indians, 146
Oxford University, 217, 218

Pacific Historical Review, noted, 63
Pagasinan language, 153, 161
Palmer, Roger, 220
Pardo, Fr. Jacinto, 161
Parras, Mexico, 147
Pátzcuaro, 142–144, 146, 147
"Pedro de Mercado and Mexican Jesuit Recruits," by ERNEST J. BURRUS, 140–152
Pendleton, George H., 7, 22
Pennsylvania protectionists, 10
Perry County, Alabama, 31, 34
Petre, Fr. Edward, 220–223, 227
Perth, Earl of, see Drummond
Philadelphia, 1846, 243
PHELAN, JOHN LEDDY, "Philippine Linguistics and Spanish Missionaries, 1565–1700," 153–170
Philippines, Jesuits in, 146, 148, 150; linguistics, 153–170
Philosophical Library, publications noted, 61–63
Pierce, Franklin, 9
PIETRASZEK, BERNADINE, "Britain and Direct Spanish-American Trade, 1815–1825," 67–100
Pike, Lt. Col. Zebulon M., 111, 113, 121, 201
Piret, Fr. Andrew D. J., 229–237
Placencia, Fr. Juan de, 155–156, 161, 167
Polk, James K., 237
Powis, Lord, 223, 228
PRAUS, ALEXIS A., ed., "Father Piret Lands in New York, 1846," 229–235
Preliminary Studies of Texas Catholic Historical Society, 49, 50
Price College, Texas, 53
Protestants, and James II, 215–228
Puebla, Mexico, 147
Pugh, George E., 4, 7

Rada, Fr. Martín de, 154, 160
RAHILL, PETER J., "An Episcopal Contribution to History," 48–55
Ramsdell, Charles, 171
REARDON, JOHN J., revs. *History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century*, 180
Red Cloud Agency, 208
Red Scare, A Study in National Hysteria, noted, 187
Republican Party, 1860–1865, 6, 11, 16, 18–19, 21, 24–26
Richardson, William A., 8
Rio de la Plata, trade, 68 ff.
Rochester, Earl of, 222, 223
Rossiter, Clinton, noted, 63–64
Royal Company of the Philippines, 74
Runes, Dagobert D., *Treasury of Philosophy*, noted, 62

Sahagún, Fr. Bernardino de, 165
Salamanca, Univ. of, 141
Salisbury, Earl of, 218
Saltonstall, Brayton, 229–230
San Antonio, Texas, archives, 51
San Carlos, Duke of, 75–77, 79, 88
Sánchez, Fr. Alonzo, 154, 157
Sánchez Baquero, Fr. Juan, 140, 143
Sánchez, Fr. José, 160
Sánchez, Fr. Mateo, 160
Sánchez, Fr. Pedro, 142
San Fernando, Duke of, 81
Samar, 160
San Luis de la Paz, 147
Santa Ana, Antonio López de, 132
Schmucker, George B., 134–139
Schuler, Bishop A. S., 53
SCHULTE, MARIE LOUISE, "Catholic Press Reaction to the Custer Disaster," 205–214
Scourge of the Swastika, by Lord Russell, noted, 63
Selma, Alabama, 31, 39, 41
Seward, William H., 24, 30
Seymour, Gov. Horatio, 22
Shellbarger, Samuel, 16–17, 27
Sheridan, Gen. Phillip, 205
SHIELS, W. EUGENE, revs. *Kino Reports to Headquarters*, 58
Sinaloa, 147
Sioux Indians, 205–208
Sitting Bull, 205, 213
SISK, GLENN, "Social Aspects of the Alabama Black Belt, 1875–1917," 31–47
Slavery, political question, 3–30
Smelser, Marshall, *The Campaign for the Sugar Islands, 1759*, revd., 237–238
"Social Aspects of the Alabama Black Belt, 1875–1917," by GLENN SISK
Society of Jesus, see Jesuits
Society of the Propagation of the Faith, 52
South American Company, British, 97
South Atlantic Quarterly, noted, 64
Southern Messenger, 54
South Sea Company, 68
Spain, and British commerce, 67–100
Spencer, Robert, Earl Sunderland, 222–224
Standard, Diffie W., *Columbus, Georgia, in the Confederacy*, noted, 191
Stanton, Edwin M., 12
St. Edward's University, Texas, 49
Stevens, Thaddeus, 14, 19, 25
St. Francis Borgia, 140–142, 148
Strangford, Viscount, 68
Strickland, Sir Roger, 220
Sumter County, Alabama, 31, 34
"'Sunset' Cox, Leader of Lincoln's Loyal Opposition, 1861–1865," by DAVID LINDSEY, 3–30

Taft, William H., 132
Tagalog, language, 153–157
Talavera, Miguel de, 155–156, 161
Talbot, Richard, Earl Tyrconnel, 222–224, 227
Tarahumara Indians, 147
Taylor, Zachary, 114
Tarascan Indians, 146
Tennessee, 196
Tepehuanes, 147
Tepotzotlán, 146, 147
Terry, Gen. Alfred, 206, 207, 210
Test Act, 215, 222
Texas, Catholic records in, 48–55
Texas Knights of Columbus, 48–50, 55
Texas Sketchbook, noted, 189
"Texas State Aid for Indigent Soldiers, 1861–1865," by WILLIAM FRANK ZORNOW, 171–175
The Art of Primitive People, J. T. Hooper and C. A. Burland, noted, 62
The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters, by Bernard Duffey, revd. 237
The Colored Citizen, 42, 46
"The Consul in a Crisis, Lower California, 1911," by LOWELL BLAISDELL, 131–139
The Emancipator, Montgomery, Ala., 42, 46
"The Enlisted Soldier at the Frontier Post, 1790–1814," by NORMAN W. CALDWELL, 196–204
"The Frontier Army Officer, 1794–1814," by NORMAN W. CALDWELL, 101–128
The Jacksonians, by L. V. White, revd., 57–58
The Louisiana Historical Review, noted, 192
The Ohio Historical Quarterly, noted, 192
"There's a Glory in the Name Ohio," by LAURENCE J. KENNY, 184–186
The San Francisco Monitor, 207, 208
The South Atlantic Quarterly, noted, 60
The Southwestern Historical Quarterly, noted, 189
The Texas Catholic, 54
Three Archbishops, by Benjamin Blied, noted, 188

The Campaign for the Sugar Islands, 1759, by M. Smelser, revd., 237–238
Tilden, Samuel J., 28
Timon, Bishop John, 51
Tod, David, 22
Tombigbee R., 40
Toulmin, Judge Harry, 203
Treasury of Philosophy, D. Runes, noted, 62
TREGLE, JR., JOSEPH G., revs. *The Jacksonians*, 57
Tuskegee Institute, 42, 43, 47
Tyrconnell, see Talbot

UNESCO, Representative Works, noted, 187
Union Springs, Alabama, 31, 39
Uniontown, Alabama, 31, 34
University of California Press, noted, 188
University of Missouri Press, noted, 187
University of Notre Dame, archives, 51
United States–Mexico, relations, 131–139

Vallandigham, Clement L., 7, 16, 17, 22–24, 27
Van Buren, Martin, 9
Vaughan, Charles R., 69, 70, 72
Vega, Celso, 136, 138, 139
Vichy Political Dilemma, Paul Farmer, revd., 239
Vicol language, 153, 159–162
Villaseca, Alonso de, 143
Vives, Jaime Vicens, *Bibliographia Historicade España e Hispanoamerica*, noted, 241
Voorhees, Daniel W., 22

Walker, Obadiah, 218
Walker, William, 13
Walt Whitman's Concept of the American Common Man, noted, 241
Wade, Benjamin F., 4, 14, 16
War Department, 1876, 198, 205, 207
Washington, Cantonment, 199, 200
Washington, D. C., 1846, 243–244
Wellesley, Henry, 68–75, 79, 81, 96
Wellesley, Arthur, Duke of Wellington, 75, 77, 84–85
Western Home Journal, 206–207
Westmorland, Earl of, 80
West Virginia History, noted, 191
WEYAND, T. NORMAN, revs., B. Duffey, *The Chicago Renaissance in American Letters*, 237
White, Leonard D., *The Jacksonians*, revd., 57
Wilgus, A. Curtis, *The Caribbean, Its Economy, 1953*, noted, 60
Wilkinson, Gen. James B., 105, 108–110, 119, 120, 196
Wilkinsonville, 119, 121
William and Mary Quarterly, noted, 63–64, 191
William of Orange, 222
Wilson, Henry Lane, 134
Wilson, Huntington, 133
Wilson, Sir Robert, 80

" X Y Z" affair, 112

Zacatecas, 144, 146
Zarfate, Fr. Gaspar, 161
ZORNOW, WILLIAM FRANK, "Texas State Aid for Indigent Soldiers, 1861–1865," 171–175

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
3 0311 00147 6196

BX 940 .I342 v.37

Mid-America: an historical review.

3 0311 00147 6196